

Very Basic Review for Intro to Qualitative Research in Education
Berbary 2012

PLEASE NOTE: This review discusses paradigm rather than epistemology. However, based on our class, I expect that you are fully educated on epistemologies, specifically objectivism, constructionism, and subjectivism. I also expect that you have greater understanding of theory than included in this basic review.

Many of my students entered my introduction course thinking that we were going to learn about “qualitative statistics”—please don’t ever use this term in my class because it simply does not make sense in a qualitative paradigm. The qualitative you learned about in EDPR 8561 was NOT about statistics or numerical data or even about counting the number of times someone has said something in the open-ended part of a survey. Instead our class was about language-based data collected through a qualitative process that is grounded in a qualitative paradigm/epistemology and moves from theory (lens of research), to methodology (rationale for methods), to methods (data collection procedures), to analysis/interpretation, to representation (how you represent your data to an audience), and back to theory to conclude. Specifically you learned about qualitative research grounded in constructionist and subjectivist epistemologies or as Glesne¹ calls it, research grounded in the paradigms of interpretivism, critical theory, and post-structuralism (p. 7).

1. Glesne, C. (2011). *Becoming qualitative researchers: An introduction* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.

The following is a chart for you to review that will lie out those major differences between quantitative research and qualitative research (often seen as a difference in paradigm--quantitative research is often objectivist/positivist while qualitative is often constructionist/subjectivist/interpretivist/critical/post-structural). This will help to get everyone on the same page in regards to understanding the general expectations for qualitative work.

Epistemology: How we know what we know	Objectivist A=B Capital T-truth	Constructionist/Subjectivist A may =B or not or maybe C Multiple truths
Research Type* *Also mixed methods	Quantitative Research →	← Qualitative Research
Theory (Macro level): Lens through which we look at research	Positivism/post-positivism →	← Multiple ex. Feminism, critical theory, critical race theory, post-structuralism
Purpose:	To predict, prove, or disprove Based on hypothesis Deductive (OD): theory testing	To understand, to emancipate, to deconstruct Based on research questions Inductive (CSI): theory generating
Design/Methodology: Rationale for methods	Ex. Experimental, quasi-experimental, pre-experimental, non-experimental , single-subject	Ex. Ethnography, action research, case study, autoethnography, narrative analysis, discourse analysis
Methods: Procedures for data collection	→ Ex. Survey, questionnaire, pre/post test, structured observation (checks duration/frequency)	← Ex. In-depth Interviews, participant observation, artifact collection, focus groups

Very Basic Review for Intro to Qualitative Research in Education
Berbary 2012

	Type: unobtrusive—typically closed-ended (very structured)	Type: typically open-ended (semi- or unstructured)
Sample Who and how get participants	Random, large sample sizes Desire to be generalizable	Purposeful, small sample sizes Desire to understand nuances of lived experiences
Typical Attributes of Research Type	Numerical data, report in numbers, graphs, charts, often little contact with participants	Word/language data, report in words and can be traditional or creative analytic practice, great contact with participants

I am also including short summary on macro theory. I teach that theory is the lens from which you look out onto your content as well as your methodology. Different theories make work look very different--for example a study using critical theory will have different expectations and outcomes than one grounded in queer theory. Below I discuss these macro theories from my perspective: as the lens of research. Please go through them and your notes from EDPR 8561 so that you are able to be articulate around the major theories used in qualitative work.

Objectivism

Post-positivism

TO DISPROVE (to predict)—falsification
Kuhn, Popper

Control for bias, decontextualized findings, level of objectivity vs. absolute, approximate capital T truth vs. certainty, template, still a bit of arrogance where science is something specifically observed AND it is more valued than perception.

Words: Reliability, generalization, validity, data reduction, bias control

Constructionism

Symbolic Interactionism

TO UNDERSTAND
GH Mead, Blumer

Humans create objects with meaning through interaction, putting oneself in the place of other, take the standpoint/role of others, role taking through dialogue—an interaction where we share through language. Often associated with grounded theory.

Words: Grounded in data, interactions with objects, world is symbolic, standpoint of others

Phenomenology

TO UNDERSTAND
Husserl, Heidegger

“Back to the things themselves”—traditionally critical-culture is productive AND limiting—a way of seeing is a way of not seeing, has some objective notes here, but usefully critical, BUT American very

Very Basic Review for Intro to Qualitative Research in Education Berbary 2012

subjective—about others perceptions and experiences, essence of shared experience but no longer critical. Can be a theory, methodology, and a method.

Words: Shared experiences, essence, perspective of others

Critical Theory

TO CRITIQUE/EMANCIPATE

Marx, Frankfurt School, Du Bois, Althusser

Grounded in Marx ideas of economics of production, praxis (action/theory), looks at power on socio-political structures, brings about change through revolution or by “calling people out.”

Words: Ideology, power structures, interpellation, State Apparatus, praxis, revolution, oppression, conflict, change, emancipation, hegemony, ethnocentrism, false needs

Feminism(s): Liberal, socialist, radical, cultural, Black, Chicana, post-structural, etc

TO CRITIQUE/EMANCIPATE

Simone de Beauvoir, Virginia Woolf, Audre Lorde, bell hooks, Rubin, Marilyn Frye, Freidan, Gloria Anzaldua, Judith Butler

Focus on intersectionality, gender, sexuality, class, race, challenge binaries to be more equal, 3 waves, power structures and how they relate to experiences of women

Words: Empower, equalize, challenge, give voice to those “othered,” social categories, privilege, re-define binaries, false consciousness, patriarchy, phallogentrism, heterosexism, discrimination, identity

CRT

To CRITIQUE/EMANCIPATE

Du Bois, Delgado, Crenshaw, Bell, Freeman, Ladson-Billings

Came out of critical legal studies:

1. Race is a social construction
2. Skeptical of colorblindness/commitment to expose white privilege
3. Racial epistemology that privilege story-telling (counter-stories for transformation)

Words: Counter stories, story-telling, narration, expose racism, double consciousness, white supremacy, institutionalized racisms, afrocentric

Subjectivism

Post-structuralism

TO DECONSTRUCT/EXPOSE

Foucault, Derrida, Cixous, Irigaray, Kristeva, Butler

Exposes the ways that structures are contingent, multiple, and always ready constituted within discourse. Highlights power relations, discursive discipline, and the ways that dominant discourses play into our subjectivities—how one becomes a subject, a self, an I. Deconstructs how structures not “REAL” but are fictitiously held to be seen as truth through repetition, truth is partial, local, and contingent. We word the world—language constructs reality—but relation between signifier and signified is arbitrary and therefore can be re-deployed in different, more useful ways.

Very Basic Review for Intro to Qualitative Research in Education
Berbary 2012

Words: Dominant discourse, discipline, power relations, subversive repetition, deconstruction, multiplicity, constituted by, always already, simulacrum, troubles, performativity, “doing things differently,” crisis of representation, subjectivity

Queer Theory

TO DECONSTRUCT/EXPOSE

Even Sedgwick, Judith Butler

Points out the social construction of sexuality and challenges the homo/hetero binary noting that to claim any position simply reinforces the opposing position something that simply reinforces unequal power relations. Therefore, move to queer gender/sexuality so that there aren't stable identity positions but instead fluid, multiple, overlapping, and contingent possibilities. “Do sexuality differently”

Words: Very similar to post-structural language

Let's remind you of considerations a researcher has to make before entering the field. In particular, as we determine our research design, we have to consider our topic, a review of literature, our theoretical context, purpose, research questions, and selection of participants. We have already looked at how these considerations differ between quantitative research and qualitative research. We will now explore these considerations specifically within a qualitative paradigm.

Unlike quantitative methods that use surveys or questionnaires as tools of data collection, in qualitative research we ourselves are the “tool” of research. We are the filters through which all data passes. Therefore, while in positivist paradigms the expectation is to control for bias, in more interpretivist/critical/post-structural paradigms there is the recognition that this is both impossible and undesirable. We cannot separate our bias, our experiences, or ourselves from our qualitative research. Therefore, in order to maintain rigor and trustworthiness, qualitative researchers “unpack” or disclose their bias, past experiences, or as we call it SUBJECTIVITIES. In many rigorous qualitative studies you will find what are called subjectivity statements—statements where the researcher reveals their social positions, experiences, bias, expectations in an attempt to be both “transparent” and reflexive. Revealing subjectivities makes the reader aware of the filter through which research design, collection, and representation passes, allowing the audience to have better understanding of how research is always grounded within a certain perspective, historical regime, or cultural moment. The following is an example of a subjectivity statement found within my own research:

At the time I conducted this study, I was a 28-yearold PhD candidate from Buffalo, NY, new to both Southern culture and Southern sorority culture. My first experience with sorority culture occurred when I found myself “inappropriately” wearing sweatpants in a sea of short skirts, high heels, pearls, and hair ribbons at our university's football game. I immediately became aware of the differences

Very Basic Review for Intro to Qualitative Research in Education
Berbary 2012

between those gendered expectations I had grown accustomed to in Buffalo and those by which I now found myself surrounded. While my initial reaction to sorority culture was disgust and stereotyping, I soon found my perspective shifting as I began teaching sorority students and better understanding how their performances of gender were enabled, reinforced, and almost demanded by the larger discourses in which they found themselves.

In order for readers to have a clear understanding of my research, it was important that they know my age, background, and experience with sororities. It may make a difference in my interpretations that I was never in a sorority and so it is important to reveal that to my audience. This is not seen as a “limit” or “fault” of qualitative research because we are not looking to prove or capture the absolute reality—instead we are trying to understand and relay a reality that is reflective of lived experience. Therefore, it is always already understood that a researcher’s subjectivities become part of the research design, collection, and representation. You will both read about subjectivity in your book, and write your own subjectivity statement as part of a discussion board.

Finally, when entering the field we have to think about ethics. Ethics are sometimes different within qualitative paradigms because rather than be disconnected from participants or have the ability to maintain anonymity (keep participant names anonymous), qualitative research demands that researchers build rapport, spend long hours with participants, and maintain confidentiality (we can’t keep participant anonymous because we meet with them face to face). This brings up different ethical dilemmas and concerns. As qualitative researchers, we have to consider *a priori* ethics such as informed consent, IRB review, and protection of vulnerable populations such as people with disabilities, pregnant women, prisoners, and minors. We also have to consider *a posteriori* ethics such as those concerns that arise during research concerning researcher-participant power dynamics, friendships, confidentiality, and care of self (not going into locations that can create personal harm).

Now let’s review considerations that you must make as you enter the field and begin data collection. Before you begin collection, however, you must have a clear understanding of your methodology because it provides the rationale for your methods. Too many qualitative endeavors ignore methodology and simply begin with methods. As an Associate Editor of a journal, I always reject those qualitative studies that don’t have a methodology because there is NO way for me to evaluate their choice of methods. Therefore, be sure that you choose a methodology so that you can provide rationale for the methods you use. You will note that you will be reading basic interpretive research for Week 6. These tend to be acritical, atheoretical, and lack clear methodology. Although some consider this “good” research, there is general agreement among current qualitative researchers that this is not rigorous enough. In this class, we will assume that rigorous qualitative research ALWAYS has to have a clear methodology such as grounded theory, phenomenology, case study, ethnography, autoethnography, narrative inquiry, or action research. Each one of these methodologies has clear methods that are

Very Basic Review for Intro to Qualitative Research in Education
Berbary 2012

specifically useful to the methodological expectations and purposes.

When we speak of methods, they are numerous. One of my pet peeves is when people simply say that they are using interviews. This tells me nothing. Rather you should all be able to say what type of interview you are using. Interview types include: in-depth, semi-structured, unstructured, narrative, life story, life history, photo-elicited, and more. Each has a specific purpose and is better aligned with specific methodologies. For example, the methodology of narrative inquiry is best aligned with unstructured, narrative, life story, and life history because this type of interviewing best allows for the elicitation of narrative data. You'll notice I did not mention STRUCTURED interviews. This is because in true qualitative research we do not use them. Structured interviews are better suited to quantitative or positivist studies that try to generalize. Remember that our type of qualitative, grounded more in interpretivist/critical/post-structural paradigms is not generalizable but TRANSFERABLE. This means that we provide detailed, in-depth, thick, rich description of our research location, participants, and findings so that others can decide for themselves if it transfers or translates into their own experiences. In other words, when I studied Zeta Chi sorority I was not trying to generalize and say that ALL sororities are like this, but instead I was saying here is a thick, rich description of one sorority—take from it what you will. It may apply to other sororities or it may not—BUT either way it is still meaningful and useful because qualitative respects that each person can contribute to our understandings of the social world.

Other than the various types of interviews, qualitative researchers also use non-participant observation, participant observation, artifact collection, document analysis, personal journals, and both informal interviews/observations. Please remember that each type offers different perspectives and strengths—hence why they align better with certain methodologies.

Remember doing our non-participant observation and participant observation activities? Be sure to use overt language—language that is not based on subjective understanding. For example, don't say short table, say a table that is 3 feet from the ground. If you keep covert language in your expanded notes, but sure to put [] around it. Also if you do want to include personal thoughts/comments/opinions that is great, BUT be sure to put them in parenthesis and label them as observer comments denoted by (OC: your comment). After you take written notes in the field, you will have to sit an expand them. Notice the key that begins the notes. Here is an example of expanded field notes:

Non-participant Observation Assignment

NOTE: This is a great example. It could be improved by including more (Observer comments) in order to account for researcher subjectivity. There are also places that could still be unpacked a bit more.

Text Key

[xxx] Covert language

(xxx) Observer comments/thoughts

Very Basic Review for Intro to Qualitative Research in Education
Berbary 2012

11/4/2010

Cameron Brown Slow-Pitch Softball Complex
Germantown, Tennessee

It is 7:02 pm on Thursday evening and the sky is a [peaceful] dark black (OC: I'm feeling very happy because the weather is reminding me of where I grew up). Cameron Brown softball complex has four regulation length softball fields, 310ft from home plate to the center field fence which are arranged around a square white brick building. The central building has a vertically-sliding silver door that is closed, and two sets of metal picnic tables with connecting benches sit three feet in front of the building and the silver door. On the opposite side of the building are two metal doors painted [ugly] hunter green, with blue and white "men" and "women" signs at a level of 5 feet above the ground. The building is surrounded on all sides by almost-white looking gray cement interspersed with filled circles of brownish red cement (OC: It is not a very attractive building.).

Tonight two of the fields are without lights, and the other two are lighted by 50 foot metal light poles, six of which can be seen around the outside of the silver chain link fence that surrounds each field. Each light pole has six large white lights, two rows of three each. The silhouettes of various insects are moving around each individual light. The fields each have a dirt infield, with a three foot wide rim of grass and dead brown leaves edging it. The infield appears to be recently wet, with a dark color and marks where shoes have dug into the loose dirt. The outfield is green grass, with no dead leaves. There is a chain link dugout on each side of the infield, approximately 10 feet deep by 25 feet long. There is an equally long silver metal bench in each and multiple persons dressed in matching t-shirts. There are three sets of bleachers outside the chain link fence surrounding the field, each with three tiers of benches (OC: This reminds me of the field I used to play on in college). One is approximately 8 feet away from the third base dugout, and there is one in this same position on the first base side of the field. In addition, there is another three-tiered set of bleachers approximately eight feet behind the fence surrounding home plate. It is beginning to sprinkle rain, and the breeze is intermittent and [chilly], about 50 degrees. The blue and red lights of an airplane can be seen above, and the noise of the airplane is louder than the conversation and cheering of the teams and spectators.

I'd also like to provide you with an example of a good semi-structured interview guide. A good guide is based on strong research questions, good lead questions, and good prompts. It has to be well-developed, in a logical order, long enough to maintain an hour interview, in the language of participants, and truly open-ended. Remember that interview questions are NOT research questions. Research questions are written in academic language (What discourses of femininity are enabled within Zeta Chi sorority?). Interview questions, on the other hand, are written in common day language, try to elicit thick description, begin with "Tell me," and help to collect data to answer your research questions (Tell me about a specific time that you went out downtown with your sorority sisters). Semi-structured means that you have certain questions that you want to ask, but you are also flexible enough to let the participant take you off topic or into long narratives at times. The following is an example of a well-developed semi-structured interview guide:

Good Life And Healthy Mind Camp: GLAHM Camp

Research Question 1: What are common experiences shared among participants of GLAHM camp?

Very Basic Review for Intro to Qualitative Research in Education
Berbary 2012

Lead Question 1A: Tell me about your decision to come to GLAHM camp...

Follow-up questions:

- A. What are some reasons you have decided to attend GLAHM camp?
(Areas of personal interest/personal reasons)
- B. What types of support have you received in relation to participation in camp? (Family, financial, friends, agency)
- C. What are some potential concerns that you have about participation in GLAHM camp?
- D. What are/were your expectations for this week? What do you want to get out of this experience? (Are they interested in building relationships, increase self-esteem, personal care, and reintegration into community)

LQ1B: Tell me about some of your experiences in GLAHM camp...

Follow-up questions:

- A. What kinds of activities have you participated in at GLAHM camp?
- B. What kinds of relationships can be created with other participants at GLAHM camp?
- C. What kind of atmosphere does GLAHM camp provide for you?

RQ2: What are the relationships between participation in GLAHM camp and post-injury well-being?

LQ2A: Tell me about your injury....

Follow-up questions:

- A. What was life like before your injury?
- B. What was life like after your injury?
- C. How has your injury impacted your sense of self? (self-esteem, sense of worth, how other see you..)

LQ2B: Tell me about what you have learned about yourself since being at GLAHM camp...

Follow-up questions:

- A. How has participation in GLAHM camp impacted your sense of self?
- B. What experiences stand out for you as being most valuable?
- C. What are areas that could be further explored or improved upon at GLAHM camp?

RQ3: How might participation in GLAHM camp transfer into the everyday experiences of the participants?

Very Basic Review for Intro to Qualitative Research in Education
Berbary 2012

LQ3A: Tell me about what you will take with you from GLAHM camp...

Follow-up questions:

- A. How will you use what you have learned at GLAHM camp in your life?
- B. What do you feel are the most valuable lessons/relationships that you will take with you as you leave GLAHM camp?

As you use a guide, you want to remember that you want to elicit thick, rich narratives. However, if you find that the participant is talking all of the time, you probably aren't doing a good enough job of probing and leading the conversation. You want to have a balance between the participant voice and your own voice.

Now let's talk about qualitative data analysis. The most important aspect of qualitative analysis is to recognize that it occurs simultaneously with data collection. Think about it: a woman walks into your house wearing a horrible dress. You don't first notice the dress—the color, shape, length, style, pattern—AND then days later decide what you think of it. Instead, you simultaneously look at it and think “God, that is an ugly dress.” This is similar to how data analysis works—as soon as you enter the field you begin informal analysis.

Generally, qualitative researchers begin to analysis and make interpretations of data beginning with the first data collection. We then use that data collection to help focus the next collection and the next collection and so on. In other words, we enter the field with broad questions and observations and then use informal analysis to help focus our lens and funnel our inquiry. Often we will use personal journals/reflective memos (notes on our personal experiences, reflections, and insecurities), procedural memos (notes on collection procedures, organizational strategies, and general inquiry decisions), and analytic memos (notes on informal analysis, emergent/identified categories, themes, and future topics for inquiry) to keep track of our movement through and around data collection (see Glesne pp. 188-193). Once we being formal analysis we also continue to take memos in order to increase trustworthiness and leave a trail of our decision-making strategies.

During this informal analysis you will also begin transcription of data—the process of turning your recorded interviews into word documents. Transcription is sometimes sent out by the researcher to be “transcribed” by professionals and can take various forms. Generally, I argue that it is best to do your own transcriptions because 1. You will better know your own data by listening to it as you write it out word-by-word and 2. Transcription services are very expensive and aren't always accurate. In terms of form, some people will take shortcuts and only transcribe portions they feel are relevant to their data—this however is terribly problematic because we never know what is relevant until we complete our project. Therefore, I always transcribe entire interviews and I hope that you will also always do the same. There is an example of a completed transcript in under

Very Basic Review for Intro to Qualitative Research in Education
Berbary 2012

this unit. I ask that you take a look at it—please note the key at the top. Your own transcriptions should follow this form. You will continue transcription through informal and formal analysis until all data is fully transcribed.

Formal analysis can take many forms and is dependent on your purpose, paradigm, theory, and audience. There are two major types of data analysis: categorizing and contextualizing. Categorizing has its roots in a more positivist paradigm and therefore it tries to reduce data down to shared experiences, essences, themes, or models. Generally, the researcher uses line-by-line coding to look for emergent or repetitive categories, which are then grouped into shared themes. This is a traditional way of analyzing qualitative data and therefore is often relied upon by novice researchers and by researchers using those methodologies such as grounded theory and phenomenology, which are more closely aligned to traditional paradigms. This traditional categorizing analysis is often called thematic analysis, although some will misuse the term grounded theory to refer to this type of analysis. Please in your own work, refer to it as traditional thematic analysis. This analysis often lends itself best to traditional representations (see Unit 5).

The second type of analysis is contextualizing analysis, which has its roots in the more critically and post-structurally grounded paradigms. These paradigms recognize multiple truths, the importance of participant voice, and the relevance of contextualizing data as it is more often experienced in lived realities. Generally, the researcher identifies major findings based on repetitive ideas or *a priori* theoretical concepts (such as post-structural concepts of discourse and discipline). Once these major findings are identified, researchers, rather than reduce data into discrete categories and themes, try to show the ways that major themes relate, overlap, and connect. They illuminate tensions, discrepancies, and multiplicities found in the data, often presenting them through narratives, stories, and counter-stories (stories that disrupt the dominant narratives). This is a more critical, post-structural way of analyzing qualitative data and therefore is often relied upon by researchers using those methodologies such as critical/post-structural/feminist/critical race ethnography, autoethnography, and narrative inquiry, which are more aligned with paradigms of emancipation and deconstruction (see Glesne p. 7). This contextualizing analysis is often referred to as narrative analysis or rhizomatic analysis. This analysis often lends itself best to representations that use creative analytic practices.

Please note that the data collection methods you use also affect which kind of analysis you can do. For instance, it is very difficult to do contextualizing analysis if your methods haven't collected narrative, thick data. In other words, it will be more difficult to do contextualizing analysis on data collected through semi-structured interviews than it would be to do it on data collected from narrative, unstructured, or life story interviews. I wanted to point this out so that you can see the importance of laying out a coherent research design that will allow you to connect each component from paradigm to theory to methodology to method to analysis/interpretation to representation. While data is "emergent" the design of your research can't shift too much from the original or you will not have a strong design. For example, it will be difficult after data collection with a

Very Basic Review for Intro to Qualitative Research in Education
Berbary 2012

semi-structured guide to all of a sudden switch to contextualizing analysis. How you collect data directly affects what you can do with it in terms of analysis and representation.

Although categorizing and contextualizing analysis are two major types of analysis, there are many various analysis processes utilized in qualitative research. You will learn about these options for analysis in your assigned readings and will explore their differences in your discussion board responses.

During the actual process of analysis, many researchers continue to use “old school” pen and paper analysis techniques such as color coding with markers, cutting and pasting themes, index cards, post-it notes, and dry erase boards. However, there are also qualitative computer programs that offer cyber organizational tools. Unlike quantitative software, such as SPSS (statistical package for the social sciences), which actually analyze data for you, qualitative programs are simply organizational tools. These program are very helpful for students and should be explored. Such programs include Nvivo and AtlasTi. Check our computer room in Ball Hall for student access to such programs.

On to qualitative data representation. This is the component of the research process that considers how one presents her data to an audience. There are two main types of representation in qualitative research: traditional representation and creative analytic practice.

Traditional representations align best with traditional analysis and those methodologies aligned with the interpretivist paradigm (the qualitative paradigm most closely aligned with positivist values). In general, although found within qualitative research, this style of representation relies more heavily on positivist notions of absolute Truth, validity, reliability, and researcher authority. They tend to reveal less researcher subjectivity and are written in a detached academic voice. Often the research is presented in **themes** with the **researcher’s interpretation** provided upfront, followed by participant quotes, which provide “**evidence**” of the validity of researcher interpretation. For example, the following presents a finding from my research on sorority women. Although I used CAP for my actually dissertation, here I wrote it up in a traditional format to highlight traditional representations:

Going out “safely” (Theme)

Participants often talked about going out to meet guys. In this university town, that often meant going downtown to the bars at the edge of campus. Concerns about safety were clearly salient in these discussions about going out because guys, especially guys they didn’t know, were seen as dangerous. The main concern about safety related to fear that college guys would take advantage of them. (**Detached researcher interpretation**) Courtney, age 19, discussed issues of guys and safety when she stated:

Very Basic Review for Intro to Qualitative Research in Education
Berbary 2012

A lot of them are not quality guys, you've got to be careful. No guy's ever looking for a relationship. Guys are looking at me like 'Oh she's a nice ass.' They're not all immature but there's nothing calling them to be mature. (Evidence)

This is the most widely accepted form of representation for qualitative research because it is most closely connected with positivist values and therefore satisfies both quantitative and qualitative audiences. However, with the move from interpretivist paradigms to more critical/post-structural paradigms, this traditional representation has been heavily critiqued within certain qualitative circles. Many critical researchers find fault with traditional representations because they have the tendency to reduce lived experiences (if a participant's experience doesn't fit we omit it), claim authority over participant lives (the researcher's voice is privileged over participant voices which are simply used as evidence), and decontextualize data (impose false organizing structures onto the realities of messy lived experiences). Post-structural researchers also find fault with traditional representations that claim to represent the "TRUTH" of people's realities and ignore the ways the subjectivities of researcher's influence research findings.

Objections to the basic tenets of being able to "capture reality" were first upset within traditional ethnography. Traditional ethnography relied on categorizing analyses and representations, claiming that a researcher could go to another culture, research it, and then report an unbiased TRUTH of that culture to an audience back home. However, soon it became obvious that many of these early ethnographies were actually highly biased even laced with hints of racism and ethnocentrism (judging everything from the viewpoint of one's own culture rather than from within its own culture). This simple realization opened up discussions within qualitative research about our ability to both remain objective and represent or capture the TRUTH of others. Instead, critical and post-structural researchers argue that we are always part of our research (hence subjectivity statements) and that even in our best attempts we still only capture local, partial, momentary truths of people's realities.

In particular, post-structural notions of language forced us to further recognize our inability as researchers to represent TRUTH and objective realities. Post-structuralists argue that as soon as we change thoughts into language we are already once removed from the TRUTH of experience and therefore it can never be captured. Think about it this way: have you ever played the telephone game where you whisper something into the first person's ear and then wait to see what it becomes by the last person? More interpretivist paradigms in qualitative research would argue that "I like to eat Italian food" would sound the same by the time it got to the last person. Critical and post-structuralists would argue that by the last person, "I like to eat Italian" might sound like "I like pork medallions." In other words, many interpretivists believe we can still capture the true essences of people's experiences, while those grounded in a more critical/post-structural paradigm would argue that we only capture aspects of realities and that even those aspects we capture are contingent (constantly changing) and grounded within specific historical and cultural moments. Therefore, researchers cannot capture objective Truth. This recognition ignited the "crisis of representation" in qualitative research which

Very Basic Review for Intro to Qualitative Research in Education
Berbary 2012

highlights the impossibility of capturing and relaying the objective Truth of experience within qualitative research, therefore challenging us to “do representation differently.”

Rather than allow this inability to represent “Truth” or “the real” to hinder research, many have used it to drive the reconsideration of age-old notions of authority, validity, and reliability and have opened new possibilities for representation. Those researchers who are choosing to “do representation differently” are balancing the line between fact and fiction, creating representations through the use of creative analytic practices (CAP). These creative practices utilize such genres as fiction, poetry, narrative, and performance, and rather than try to represent the TRUTH, instead try to tell the most useful story that is grounded in the data.

CAP aligns best with contextualizing/narrative/rhizomatic analysis and those methodologies aligned with the critical/post-structural paradigms (the qualitative paradigms least aligned with positivist values). This style of representation does not evaluate itself based on positivist notions of absolute Truth, validity, reliability, and researcher authority. Recognizing that old ways to evaluate research no longer fit the new creative productions within postmodern research, researchers dismissed traditional concepts of validity and reliability and instead Richardson (2000) asked readers to consider five different criteria when evaluating CAP research:

1. **Substantive Contribution:** Does it help us all to have a deeper understanding of how discourses of femininity are enabled, disseminated, disciplined, and negotiated?
2. **Aesthetic Merit:** Since sorority girls are often seen as trivial, will this entice us all, even those appalled by them, to keep reading? Does it give us a window into a new culture that many of us may never be able to gain access into?
3. **Reflexivity:** Is it understood that this is my interpretation of sorority culture? It is understood that this story has been purposely created by the researcher from multiple data sources to tell a specific story—a co-constructed story that highlights how sorority subjectivities are developed within discourse, rather than a story about the reality of sorority women and the “Truth” of their existence?
4. **Impact:** Does it lead readers to keep asking questions, keep wondering, and reconsider their views? Are we emotionally involved? Do we feel connected to the characters and their experiences?
5. **Expression of a Reality:** Have I created a story that highlights my research purposes but also remains credible to my research participants’ experiences? Can readers recognize the experiences, emotions, and situations within my script even if they do not have first hand knowledge of sororities?

With this I also like to add: 1. That the representation be grounded in rigorous and systematic data collection, 2. That CAP be best aligned with the paradigm of the research and most useful to the purpose of the study, and 3. That the final representation be respectful to the genre (ex. a poem be considered a “good” poem by poets). Although CAP makes room for such new and different meanings of representation, authority,

Very Basic Review for Intro to Qualitative Research in Education
Berbary 2012

validity, and reliability, it should not be assumed such freedom in meaning leads to a relaxed notion of researcher responsibility and conscience. In fact, researcher's claim that the freedom of postmodernism actually causes the opposite, we have to be even more self-conscious about claims we make about our research.

Part of being self-conscious is to make sure our work upfront reveals our own participation in the research. Therefore, CAP representations tend to uncover researcher subjectivity and challenge researcher authority by allowing participants to speak for themselves through dialogic, poly-vocal genres. For example in the article you will read about my screenplay, you will hear my participants speaking for themselves in the representation as my characters perform participant experiences. Placing the researcher interpretations after the representation rather than before it as in traditional styles also challenges researcher authority. This shares interpretation with the audience because it allows them to make sense of the data before we impose meaning onto it. Finally, you will note that data is not presented in discrete themes, but it is instead contextualized to show how themes overlap and connect in messy lived experiences. Often then, research is presented in creative genres using participant's voices, followed by researcher interpretation written in person first language to reveal subjectivities. For example, the following presents an example from my own work with sorority women. I will use the same "theme" as discussed in the traditional example above; however, please note that with this example you are presented multiple themes in a contextualized narrative:

We enter this scene as Margaret, the assigned little sister of Yarah, enters a sorority date night that is already in progress. Overwhelmed by the loud music, the sweaty bodies, and the chatter, Margaret stands on her tip toes desperately searching for Yarah in the crowd. When she sees her big sis she immediately grabs her date and drags him over to her....

Margaret
Hi! Hi!

Yarah
Oh hi! I'm glad you made it!

The two embrace- their typical salutation.

Yarah
I think you know most everyone, but I'll introduce you anyway.
Hey everyone this is my little sister Margaret.

Yarah gets the attention of everyone around her and makes sure they all meet Margaret. As her big sister, she knows how important it is to help Margaret meet as many people as she can. Margaret says hello to everyone then Yarah turns to her.

Yarah
Hey let's go get you a drink.

Margaret
What about my date?

Very Basic Review for Intro to Qualitative Research in Education
Berbary 2012

Yarah

Oh, he is friends with all the guys we brought so he'll be fine. See if he wants a drink – you know whenever you invite someone to our event you need to pay for them. So find out what he wants to drink and we'll go get it.

Margaret whispers in her date's ear to find out what he wants to drink while Yarah turns back to joke with her friends. Margaret taps Yarah on the shoulder and the two head over to the bar.

Yarah

So how is it going? Do you like him?

Margaret

Yeah, he is nice. But I don't necessarily trust him. Before we went out to dinner he apparently was "pre-gaming" and was like pounding beers. My friend thinks he was already drunk before dinner and that's why he's been so touchy feely.

Yarah

I kind of think that is just something that boys do. Like girls may just have a drink or two to have a head start, but guys want to already be drunk so they like pound the beers.

Margaret

Really!? Well, it still sketched me out.

Yarah

You know, I don't know him that well. He is a new member in Kappa Beta and my friend in the frat just thought it would be fun to set him up with my little sister. They think he is a cool guy, but that doesn't mean he isn't an ass with women. Just give him a chance and if you don't like him I'll introduce you to some other guys.

Margaret

I mean he is hot, but it's like he knows it.

Yarah orders four beers from the bartender. Margaret is a bit overwhelmed and is so thankful Yarah has taken her under her wing.

Yarah

You know as a generalization, hot guys are assholes. They kind of have a superior image of themselves, like they're God's gift to earth. They can be real nice one day and the next they act like they don't know you. Plus the hot guys are usually only after one thing.

Margaret

Well, I'm sure not going to give him anything tonight!

Yarah

Yeah, but you need to realize that most college guys are only after one thing and they know if they can't get it from you there are other people willing to give it. That's the problem with college guys in general. There's nothing that's calling them to be mature. But with hot guys it's even worse, they don't date people, they just sleep around.

Very Basic Review for Intro to Qualitative Research in Education
Berbary 2012

Margaret

So how do people ever end up with boyfriends?

Yarah

Well, they usually are with the not-as-good-looking nicer guys. But I have to warn you, I feel like no college guys are ever really looking for a relationship, girls are constantly in relationship mode and guys just want to hook up. Finding a guy here is very hard because a lot of them are not quality guys – they are very superficial. All about the physical stuff.

Margaret

That's sad.

The girls pay for their drinks and begin to try making their way back to their dates.

Yarah

Hey, hold your cup from the top as we walk back. Like this..

Yarah grabs her beer-filled cup from the top so that the palm of her hand covers the opening as they walk back to through the crowd with their drinks.

Margaret

Why?

Yarah

You don't want to get roofied, do you? Girls get roofied all the time. Someone just slips something into your drink and you don't even know it.

Margaret

Really?

Yarah

Yeah, but don't worry. I'm watching out for you. I'll teach you the ropes. Just remember not to trust anyone too quickly.

Margaret

You mean like when we are out.

Yarah

I mean ever. But if you are out and you see someone you like, always make sure they are friends with someone you know – that way you at least know they are decent people.

Margaret

Yeah, okay.

Yarah

Yeah, it's like don't just go up to some guy who you don't have any connection to cuz you never know what their intentions are. Always try to find someone you both know to introduce you.

Very Basic Review for Intro to Qualitative Research in Education Berbary 2012

This CAP would then be followed by these researcher interpretations:

Director's Comments:

Some of the more prevalent topics of girl talk that were particularly important to both group and self-surveillance were centered on issues of sexuality (heterosexuality was considered by most of my participants to be the only viable sexuality of sorority women), promiscuity, and public drunkenness. I originally thought that girl talk focused on these issues only because of these behaviors' ability to earn Zeta Chi an unladylike reputation. However, as I became more involved with participants I came to understand that there was also an underlying concern for safety that drove the disproportionate focus and strong disciplinary talk on sexual behaviors and drinking. Many of these behaviors were not only strongly disciplined because they could earn Zeta Chi a "bad" reputation, but also because such behavior left the women of Zeta Chi open to male gaze and desire, creating greater possibility for personal harm. It was clear that much of the discipline regarding these women's behaviors and appearances was meant to ensure "girl safety" in a highly heterosexual Greek university environment. Whereas discipline within Zeta Chi had always seemed restrictive, here was an example of the way in which that same discipline was "productive" as it was used to produce a system of protection for the women.

I first started to piece together the covert ways that "girl safety" influenced girl talk and the expectations of ladylikeness when a woman I was interviewing told me the "safe way" to carry my glass through the bar crowd. Because she had known friends who had been "roofied" at bars, she and all of her friends made sure to watch their drink be poured and carry it so that their palm protected the opening. Once her story alerted me to issues of safety, I realized that I had a number of stories that covertly were about "girl safety" rather than just expectations of ladylikeness. These stories included discussion about buddy systems, not walking home alone, taking care of drunk women to avoid male predators, fending off men, only dating men you know, not accepting drinks in bars, and in the most extreme cases, rape. It became clear that many of the expectations of ladylike worked to reinforce feminine decency in order to protect women from potential emotional, physical, and sexual harm by men. These issues of safety gave me a new perspective on those "restrictive" expectations of girl talk and rules of Standards. Rather than being restrictive because of expectations about ladylikeness, they were also restrictive because of discourses of masculinity and expectations of masculine sexuality, power, and action that constructed women as weak and passive sexual objects.

CAP is NOT the most widely accepted form of representation for qualitative research because it is least closely connected with positivist values and therefore often challenges people's expectations of research. However, with more researchers becoming influenced by the narrative turn (move towards valuing narratives) and post-modern turn (move towards valuing multiplicity), CAP is becoming more widely accepted and even encouraged due to its accessible nature, its ability to capture reader's attention, and its success in showing the complexities of experience.

I will admit that in the current academic climate it is more difficult to gain acceptance for CAP. Because of that many of my students use both a traditional analysis/representation for their committees, but also include aspects of CAP in their final products. However, major critiques of CAP come from those outside of a critical/post-structural paradigm who question "is this even research?" Often the response is "yes it is and you need to read more outside of just your paradigm." That is not to say that everyone has to do CAP, but we should recognize that it is just as legitimately research as more positivist/traditional forms. Both should be valued within their paradigm for the unique contributions they make to qualitative research.

Very Basic Review for Intro to Qualitative Research in Education
Berbary 2012

In the end, it is important to remember yet again that our choice as to which kind of representation we use is dependent on our paradigm, theory, methodology, choice of analysis, and intent. Typically, if we choose to use a more traditional analysis based on our paradigm/theory/methodology then we will also follow with a traditional representation. On the other hand, if we use contextualizing/narrative/rhizomatic analysis based on our paradigm/theory/methodology then we will tend to represent our data through creative analytic practices such as narrative, fiction, poetry, performance, or screenplay. I hope that you are now able to fully grasp how important it is to make sure that your choices in paradigm, theory, methodology, methods, and analysis are congruent and philosophically aligned.

Richardson, L. (2000). Evaluating Ethnography. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 6, 253-255.

I have reminded you about the intricacies of the qualitative process. You should have a clear understanding that qualitative research is not simply about collecting language-based data and sorting it into themes. Instead, rigorous qualitative research must clearly follow a well-developed design that includes the following 7 components:

1. **Epistemology/Paradigm** (philosophical underpinning)→
2. **Theory** (lens of research, both macro and mid-level)→
3. **Methodology** (rationale for methods)→
4. **Methods** (data collection procedures)→
5. **Analysis/interpretation** (exploring data—categorizing or contextualizing)→
6. **Representation** (presenting findings to an audience—either traditional or CAP)→
7. AND then connects **back to theory/literature** in order to make conclusions that are meaningful and useful to your discipline and beyond.

Remember that you don't need to solidify these components in a linear/chronological way starting with paradigm, BUT you have to be able to articulate each component and your expectations for the components BEFORE you head into the field so that you can be sure all components match up together philosophically and methodologically. Often, rather than starting with paradigm or theory, our process instead begins with an experience that we have had or an interest that we have. We can brainstorm purpose statements for our research, considering our use of "to understand, to critique, to deconstruct" (CG p.7) and considering the paradigmatic/theoretical/methodological framework that best fits with the intentions of our research. We should simultaneously consider the seven components and use trial and error to develop a rigorous and cohesive research design. As we move forward from purpose, we should begin to fill in our components making sure that each one compliments that which comes before and after it.

Now that you have a clear understanding of the components of rigorous qualitative research and how they align philosophically, it is time to explore actual qualitative studies. Therefore, the remainder of this review will focus on methodologies. We can't

Very Basic Review for Intro to Qualitative Research in Education
Berbary 2012

possibly cover all of the methodological options within qualitative research. Instead, we will focus on those that are most often used within qualitative research so that you can gain a better understanding of qualitative research in practice.

We will begin our methodological journey with more interpretive qualitative research methodologies that are traditionally most post-positivist in qualitative research. We will then move into the more critical constructionist and deconstructive subjectivist methodologies. In general, you will notice that as we move away from basic interpretive work towards the opposite end of the spectrum such as postmodern research, designs tend to become more complex, with clearer defined theory and methodology. While I want to introduce you to the full spectrum of qualitative work, I hope that each of you chooses to be a catalyst within your own field to increase qualitative rigor by conducting research based on those designs that are better suited to strong theoretical frameworks, clear methodologies, and social justice.

Phenomenology

Generally, phenomenological research is grounded in the theory of phenomenology, which attempts to get to the essence of people's perceived experiences before cultural meaning is made of them. In other words, there is an attempt to "get back to the things themselves" or the details of an experience before we allow cultural messages to impose meaning. For example, how does one experience cancer OUTSIDE of or in spite of all of the common expectations society places on the experience of having cancer such as feelings of anger, hope, sadness, strength, fear, etc.

Taking this theoretical idea of "getting back to the things themselves" and combining it with methodology, phenomenological inquiry concerns itself with understanding the shared essence of people's experiences. Traditionally, the methodology of phenomenology was meant to be critical of culture because it was intended to look at how "a way of seeing is also a way of not seeing." In other words, it would look at a person's perception of an experience and consider the alternative ways that the same phenomenon could be interpreted if cultural meaning didn't so strongly determine our perceptions of it. Therefore, this more European phenomenology was critical and was determined to help see the world differently from status quo.

When phenomenology came to America it was not well received and so rather than maintaining its traditional tenets, a new phenomenology emerged that lost the critical underpinnings and instead came to be focused on the shared perceptions of people's experiences. This is where we often find phenomenology today: as an acritical and highly subjective-oriented methodology that through phenomenological/in-depth/semi-structured interviews attempts to use traditional analysis to reduce data in order to reveal the essences of people's shared experiences. This is a popular methodology because it allows a researcher to understand the experiences of groups of people who take part in a shared phenomenon. I will use the following chart to summarize the important points of phenomenology as a methodology:

Very Basic Review for Intro to Qualitative Research in Education
Berbary 2012

Phenomenology	
Tenets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Understanding essence of experience - Describe essence of lived phenomenon - Meaning-making - Perception based - Traditional phenomenology is critical and about self - American phenomenology is acritical and about others - Tends to use traditional analysis to reduce data - More post-positivist than other methodologies - Controls subjectivity through bracketing (unlike other more critical methodologies which are upfront about subjectivity)
Theories	- Phenomenology
Methods	- Phenomenological, in-depth, semi-structured interviews, sometimes artifact collection and/or observations
Key Point	- To understand shared essence of phenomenon
Key Players	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Husserl - Heidegger - Mostakas

Grounded Theory

Traditional grounded theory developed as a response to early quantitative critiques that claimed that qualitative research did not have enough rigor or method to be considered “research” or “scientific.” Because it developed in response to quantitative critique, GT is one of the most post-positivist (more quantitative-like) methodologies found in qualitative research in terms of controlling for bias, having structured step-by-step rules for data collection and traditional data analysis, and the expectation of constructing models or mid-level theories of human behavior/experience. This strong connection to more quantitative expectations of research often makes GT a popular choice for first time qualitative researchers who find themselves within a highly quantitative field trying to bridge the gap. You will also find that disciplines that do not have long histories of strong qualitative research will often use GT as a main qualitative methodology—in other words, GT is a nice gateway from post-positivist quantitative research into more qualitative inquiry.

Although it provides a “safe” venture into qualitative research, many fields that have long histories of qualitative have moved into more critical, narrative, and post-modern methodologies and at times critique GT for being too post-positivist and not “qualitative enough.” However, there are some new developments in GT where people are leaving the traditional more post-positivist roots and instead trying to connect GT to more critical, narrative, post-modern ways of inquiry. Specifically, we see a major turn toward Constructivist GT, which takes the basic premise of traditional GT but recognizes the inability to control of bias and also highlights the constructed nature of knowledge. While

Very Basic Review for Intro to Qualitative Research in Education
Berbary 2012

Constructivist GT has gained a wide audience, some argue that it has moved so far away from the traditional tenets of GT that it should not even be called GT. Therefore, depending on your history with qualitative research, GT can be an exciting new way of doing research that is more “accepted” by quantitative paradigms, a more constructivist adaptation from an original, or an outdated post-positivist substitute for “true” qualitative inquiry. No matter what you decide to think, GT has been and continues to be a well-respected and widely known qualitative methodology.

Whether using traditional or constructivist GT, this methodology will provide you with very specific and detailed expectations for data collection and analysis. Because its major tenet is to be grounded in the data, GT does not rely on literature reviews in the ways other methodologies might. Rather, GT is fully emergent with research questions and data collection directions arising within the field. While researchers have topics and some vision of the research design, data analysis occurs immediately in the field in order to provide direction for the continuation of the study. Researchers use in-depth and semi-structured interviews with 10-40 participants (a large sample size for most other qualitative methodologies) using analytic, procedural, and reflective memos to keep track of data and use it to guide any future interviews, questions, and analysis. Data collection and analysis continue simultaneously and a specific method of analysis using open coding, axial coding, and focused coding (VERY similar to traditional thematic analysis—codes, categories, themes) is implemented in order to reduce data and highlight the “Truth” of participant experience. Once theoretical saturation is reached (no new information is presented that forces you to change the mid-level theory you have developed from the data) data collection stops and a model or mid-level theory is developed to “explain” the experience or phenomenon. Therefore, the methodology of GT begins from the start of research design (or lack of structured design) and follows a researcher throughout data collection, analysis, and representation (model/mid-level theory). Please remember that often people will misuse the term GT stating that they have done GT when really they have just used the method of thematic analysis to analyze their data. Be sure not to confuse the two. Unless you have followed the methodology of GT from start to finish, you have NOT done GT but simply used thematic analysis as your method for data reduction. I will use the following chart to summarize the important points of GT as a methodology:

Grounded Theory (GT)	
Tenets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Grounded in data - Intense coding to theoretical saturation (open, axial, focused) - Little lit review because topics emerge - Research questions not always solidified - Reliability through triangulation - Larger sizes of sample than other qualitative methodologies - Uses traditional analysis to reduce data - More post-positivist than other studies - Often misused as method of analysis but if you’re not using grounded theory as methodology, the analysis is called thematic analysis

Very Basic Review for Intro to Qualitative Research in Education
Berbary 2012

	- Constructivist GT recognizes that truth isn't emerging but that researcher's subjectivities plays into it—a less post-positivist GT
Theories	- Symbolic Interactionism
Methods	- Memoing during analysis (procedural, analytic, and reflective) - Interviews (in-depth and semi-structured)
Key Point	- To construct model or mid-level theory
Key Players	- Glaser & Strauss (Traditional) - Corbin (Traditional) - Charmaz (Constructivist)

Case Study

Case study methodology can at times use both quantitative and qualitative data; however, we will speak specifically of fully qualitative case studies.

Generally, case studies are considered similar to ethnographies (the study of day-to-day culture) because the two tend to spend long periods in the field and use similar methods: a heavy focus on participant/non-participant observation, in-depth interviews, artifact collection, and document analysis. However, they are used for different purposes. In ethnography the purpose is to determine how the culture works, while in case study the purpose is to understand an issue or problem using the case as a specific illustration. Therefore, in case study a researcher explores a bounded system in order to gain in-depth understanding and illustrate the nature of a problem or issue in context. A bounded case can be considered an individual, several individuals, a group, an activity, a specific location, or an entire program.

The overarching goal or purpose of a case study can cause the research design to take many forms. The three most popular forms of case study include intrinsic, instrumental, and collective. Intrinsic case study is focused on the case itself, simply because it presents a typical or unique case within a specific context. Instrumental case study is focused on an issue or concern that then leads a researcher to identify one bounded case to illustrate this particular issue. Finally, collective case study also focuses on an issue or concern, but rather than only illustrate it with one case, it uses multiple cases. I will use the following chart to summarize the major points of case study methodology:

Case Study	
Tenets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Develops in-depth description of case (individual, event, or location) - Seeks patterns of individual behavior - Use of triangulation - Doesn't represent world/culture (like in Ethnography), but instead is focused on just one case in relation to issue or problem - Emphasizes phenomenon, themes, and issues Types: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Intrinsic: understand the case itself

Very Basic Review for Intro to Qualitative Research in Education
Berbary 2012

	- Instrumental: insight or redraw generalization; illustration - Collective: investigate a phenomenon; several case studies
Theories	- This methodology aligns well with most of the macro theories discussed.
Methods	- Interviews, observations, artifact collection, document analysis
Key Point	- To illustrate contextualized case to illuminate issue/concern/uniqueness
Key Players	- Yin - Stake

Ethnography

We have already discussed that ethnography and case study tend to be similar. However, unlike case study, which is focused on an issue or concern, ethnography is focused on describing how an entire culture or subculture works.

You may all be familiar with ethnography because it is one of the early qualitative methodologies that was used and became well known in the fields of anthropology and sociology. In these fields, early traditional ethnography was often conducted by white, European/American researchers who would leave their home countries to live with indigenous people, typically people of color who lived in more remote areas of the world such as Africa, South America, Samoa, etc. The purpose was for the researcher to live within a culture for a number of years in order to learn the language, rituals, behaviors, expectations, rite of passage (birth, marriage, death rites), and kinship structures of that culture. These ethnographies took years to conduct (often 3 and up) and utilized multiple methods such as participant observation, in-depth interviews (also semi-structured, unstructured, ethnographic interviews), informal interviews, non-participant observation, document analysis, and artifact collection. After data collection, it was assumed a researcher then could control for biases and write up the “Truth” of that culture to relay it to an audience back in their home countries.

While today ethnographies still can span beyond 3 years and also continue to utilize these same methods, this more post-positivist understanding of the potential of ethnographic representation, where it was assumed that the reality of a culture could be captured without bias and then truthfully represented, continued to be seen as a gold standard of qualitative research for many years. However, it thankfully became clear to the research community that there were instances where researchers who claimed to (or really believed that they were) creating unbiased representations, actually were often presenting the cultures through ethnocentric and at times racist lenses. This created representations, which rather than capture unbiased Truth, actually ended up conveying distorted views of cultures that depicted “natives” (a term that has developed a negative connotation and should not be used to describe participants) as animalistic, simplistic, and exotic, further sensationalizing other cultures and fueling the divide between “us” and “them.” This recognition led to the development of less “post-positivist” ethnographies that are upfront about researcher subjectivity, challenge power dynamics between researcher and those researched, allow more room for participant voice/viewpoint, and recognize the inability to capture an unbiased representation of others.

Very Basic Review for Intro to Qualitative Research in Education
Berbary 2012

Today ethnography can be seen in multiple disciplines such as education, leisure studies, political science, and communication, and it has since taken on various forms. Rather than only take on the traditional post-positivist lens, current ethnographies use multiple theoretical perspectives including critical ethnography, feminist ethnography, and post-structural ethnography. These ethnographies no longer only try to describe and understand culture, but they also take more critical views exploring power structures/relations, marginalization, and discursive discipline within the culture. These ethnographies simultaneously recognize that each research project only can capture a contingent (momentary) and partial reality that is both filtered through the subjectivity of the specific researcher and grounded in a specific historical and cultural moment. These “new” ethnographies also different from the expectations of more traditional ethnographies because we now find ethnographies that:

1. Are conducted by people of color, women, and insiders of culture (people studying their own culture).
2. Are more and more inclusive of participant voice in order to decrease researcher authority and equalize power relations between researcher and those researched.
3. May span 9-12 months rather than 3 years and up (although 9-12 months is common in educational ethnography, this shorter time span is often critiqued by Anthropology and Sociology).
4. Study privileged/highly visible groups rather than “less privileged,” marginalized, or less visible groups.
5. Study sub-cultural groups rather than entire cultures.
6. Are represented through CAP such as fiction, narrative, screenplay, and performance.

I will use the following chart to highlight the major points of the methodology of ethnography:

Ethnography	
Tenets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Contextualizes day-to-day cultural experiences - Researcher spends long periods of time “living” with participants
Theories	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Traditionally Post-positivism - Post-structural - Feminism(s) - Critical theory - Critical race theory - Queer theory
Methods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Participant observation (main method) - In-depth interviews (second focus) - Non-participant observation - Artifact collection - Personal journals - Informal interviews

Very Basic Review for Intro to Qualitative Research in Education
Berbary 2012

	-Document Analysis
Key Point	-To understand/critique/deconstruct the day-to-day experiences of participants living within a specific culture/subculture in order to illuminate how that culture “works.”

Narrative Inquiry

Narrative inquiry (or narrative analysis) is concerned with capturing the detailed and contextualized stories of a single life or the lives of a small group of individuals. The stories or narratives captured may be oral or written, a short topical story about a specific event, a long extended story about a significant aspect of ones life, or a narrative about the whole of ones life from birth to death. No matter what form it takes, the philosophy behind narrative analysis maintains that each narrative is important in itself and can contribute to the knowledge production of the larger culture. Also it is assumed that even personal narratives are reflections of the larger culture and therefore not only illuminate personal experience, but also are always already tied to cultural discourse, ideology, and expectation. The way we structure a story (most western story-telling has a beginning, middle, end) and the stories we tell (many American’s have stories about Sweet sixteen while other cultures do not) are always reflections of specific historical and cultural moments. Therefore, narratives not only produce and contribute to the knowledge of a culture, but they also help to illuminate the way that culture is reflected in our own understandings of self, others, and the larger worlds in which we live.

Narrative inquiry, then, is concerned with how narratives contribute to larger understandings of the social world. In particular, it is concerned with the ways that **co-constructions** of narratives and the **re-storying** of narratives, specifically **counter-narratives**, can contribute to critique, change, and expansion of the taken-for-granted truths found within the “**meta-narrative**” of human progression. What do all of these concepts mean?

Co-construction: Notion that each story we tell is always already a co-construction because who we are telling the story to will always influence how we tell it. For example, say that you burn yourself in the morning while curling your hair, which then makes you late for work. When you arrive at work, your boss asks you why you were late—you quickly tell her the story: “Oh, I had a terrible accident this morning when I burned myself with the curling iron. It was really painful and so I had to take a moment to dress the burn. I’m sorry and it won’t happen again.” Later after work you end up meeting up with your best friend. You decide to also tell her the story, but it sounds a bit different: “Girl, you won’t believe what I did this morning. I was curling my hair up all pretty because I was going to have a meeting with that good-looking man at work. In the middle of curling my hair my favorite song came on so I starting rocking out to it—AND wouldn’t you know it I go and burn the crap out of my ear. I mean like almost burning the darn thing right off.” Now, neither one of these stories is more or less true. They are both the “story” of what happened this morning; HOWEVER, because narratives are always co-constructions, the stories “look” different based on the audience. Therefore,

Very Basic Review for Intro to Qualitative Research in Education
Berbary 2012

researcher's that use narrative analysis always recognize that they themselves are part of the story because the story that a participant chooses to tell them is dependent on the researcher herself.

Re-storying: Re-storying is both related to the way a story is told AND how a researcher relays a story to the audience. First we will consider what re-storying can mean in relation to the way a participant tells a story. Consider a story that you have told often about yourself or about an event in your life. I'll bet that the first time you told that story it was a bit different than the 100th time you told it. For example, my Mom has this great story about her dog that always eats his own poop. The story goes on about the time that she took the dog on an airplane. In the middle of the flight, the dog took a poop in his crate and even though she normally can't get the dog to stop eating his own poop, wouldn't you know that this is the one time he wouldn't eat it. She yelled, "Eat it you son-of-a-****, eat it." But he still wouldn't and so the story continues as my mother explains how everyone on the plane can smell something horrible.

This happens to be one of my favorite stories and so every time someone new meets my mom, I make her tell it. Well as you can imagine, the story has become better and better with each telling as additional details are added, voices are heightened/exaggerated in order to draw in the listener, and she has perfected the timing/speed/ordering etc. In other words, this story has been "re-storied" to perfection. Does this mean the story is "less true?" No, it simply means that it has been re-packaged in order to be more "useful" to the listener—it therefore is a re-storied co-construction that is meant to tell the story in way that is most relevant to the audience. You will find that during a narrative interview, you will elicit both first time stories (those that are being re-storied for the first time) and those stories that have been re-storied over and over again. Neither are more "True"—they are both relevant and important data.

Re-storying in relation to the researcher is a bit different. Rather than re-storying your own experience, the researcher will re-story the narratives of participants. This can take many forms. You may take one person's narrative and re-structure or re-order it to be more useful to the listener—for example, if a person's narrative is told to you over multiple interviews, you may take the data and organize it into a beginning, middle, and end. You may also take a person's narrative and re-story it into another genre—for example poetry, fiction, or screenplay. Finally, you may take multiple people's narratives and make a composite of them that highlights the similarities or tensions among the narratives. No matter how it is done, all narrative representations based on this methodology are narratives that are re-storied by the researcher.

Meta-narrative: This concept refers to the humanist notion that there is a story or comprehensive explanation of human progress that can be traced from the dawn of humanity to the present. This meta-narrative is made up of multiple "common cultural" narratives that help to "word our world" and construct certain ways of being, thinking, and acting. Post-structural theories often critique the reliance on meta-narratives to explain our world because meta-narratives are based on hegemonic ideologies (ideas of dominant social class), dominant discourses, and status quo. In this sense, meta-narratives

Very Basic Review for Intro to Qualitative Research in Education
Berbary 2012

often ignore or subsume the voices of non-dominant groups such as people of color, women, and lesbian, gay, bi-sexual, transgender or queer (LGBTQ) individuals.

Counter-narratives: Counter-narratives are narratives that include the voices of those non-dominant groups that have either ignored or subsumed in meta-narratives. Rather than repeat the stories of the dominant social class, counter-narratives offer alternatives, new ways of thinking, and new understandings of experience based on the lives of those individuals often silenced or left out of the dominant narrative. Critical thinkers argue that the more counter-narratives that we bring to light, the more complex our meta-narrative becomes and therefore the more it reflects the multiplicity of human experience. Post-structural thinkers, on the other hand, call for a complete rejection of the meta-narrative all together—rather than add to a meta-narrative, post-structuralists want to maintain individual narratives in their multiplicity recognizing that each narrative is just as valuable as the next. Narrative analysis is a useful methodology for constructing and illuminating counter-stories.

Now that we've explored the concepts found within narrative analysis, we will now consider the different sub-types of this methodology. Within narrative inquiry there are many different ways to approach collecting data. We will discuss a few of the most popular forms that narrative inquiry takes on in order to illuminate narratives:

Life history: This is an extensive narrative of a participant's life from birth until present. It doesn't have a topical focus, but rather discusses the entirety of one's lived experience. A life history can be autobiographical (told by self) or biographical (told by researcher).

Life story: Some will use life history and life story interchangeably, but I see them as very different approaches. Where as a life history is non-topical, meaning that it looks at the entirety of one's life, life story instead is focused on either 1. A period of one's life or a specific event (ex. College years, sorority years, birth of a child) or 2. A topical area and/or certain experience that spans across the life (ex. The story of how one's sexuality has developed over time). Again, this is different from life history because it is driven by the collection of stories around a specific event/time period OR a specific topic.

Oral History: This is the collection of stories around a specific historical event(s). The focus is not on the events themselves, but rather the meaning the events hold for the participants. For example, one might collect oral histories from African American Southerners who lived during Jim Crow.

Testimonio: Often connected with Latin American activists, *testimonio* is a life history, life story, or oral history that is specifically political with the intention of resisting oppression and challenging status quo.

It is important for you to recognize that these forms can be seen both as methodological choices AND methods choices. For example, one might say they are doing Life Story Narrative Inquiry AND would be using life story interviews. Therefore, these aren't just methodological choices, but they are also each an interview type—life history interviews,

Very Basic Review for Intro to Qualitative Research in Education
Berbary 2012

life story interviews, oral history interviews, etc. When I use this methodology I'd typically leave the "type" of narrative inquiry for the methods section...for example I'd say that I used Narrative Inquiry as the methodology and life story interviews as the method. I will use the following chart to highlight the main points of the methodology of Narrative Inquiry:

Narrative Inquiry	
Tenets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Collection of stories, narratives, counter-narratives - Meaning is made through the narrative - Narrative reflects larger culture - Everyone has a story and their story is relevant and can contribute to knowledge constructions - Privileges stories - Types: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - life history - chronological account of whole life - life story - relevant part of life - oral history - focused on marginalized voices - testimonio - political stories - Co-constructing of stories (different story for different person) - Re-storying - memories of events that become "packaged" - Counter stories – story of the "Other" - Can analyze larger culture or individual - Can create counter-stories or deconstruct stories - Can keep story clean or composite all the stories - Can analyze each individual story or look across all stories - Usually represented in CAP
Theories	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Critical - Critical race theory* - Post-structuralism* - Queer - Feminism(s)* <p>* Especially relevant to these theories because they value narratives and multiplicity of individuals</p>
Methods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Narrative Interviews (life history, life story, oral history, <i>tesimonio</i>) - Storytelling (not just eliciting facts/information, but contextualized stories)
Key Point	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To illuminate the narratives of participants in order to contribute to knowledge construction in the larger culture.

Brief Discussion of Critical and Post-modern Research

I wouldn't consider either of these types of research to be methodologies. Rather, they are ways of approaching content and methodology and in my opinion are theoretical lenses that can be applied to various methodologies.

Very Basic Review for Intro to Qualitative Research in Education
Berbary 2012

In general, you can apply critical and post-modern theoretical lens to most methodologies although generally you will not find them attached to grounded theory or phenomenology because these methodologies are more grounded in post-positivist tenets. However, I have heard that some researchers are currently playing with post-modern grounded theory and critical phenomenology. Therefore, times are changing, but generally critical theory and post-modern theory are more often connected with the methodologies of ethnography, autoethnography, and narrative inquiry because these methodologies can more easily let go of any post-positivism in their underlying purposes/tenets.

So what does it mean to do critical or post-modern research?

While basic interpretive qualitative research seeks to understand experience, critical and post-modern research moves beyond simple understanding to instead critique/emancipate or expose/deconstruct.

Critical research attempts to critique culture, emancipate participants, create revolutions of change, challenge oppression, and illuminate power structures that keep people in devalued social positions. Grounded in critical theory influenced by Marx and the Frankfurt school, critical research applies a critical lens, one that is cognizant of power structures and privilege, to content and methodology. Therefore, not only does critical research illuminate power in the context of participants' lives, but it also points out the power structures inherent in traditional research and attempts to adjust power to create a more equal balance between researcher and those researched. Specifically, then, critical researchers will attempt to share self with participants, include participant voices in analysis and representation, show the multiplicity of participants' experiences, and create policy or social change through their research.

Post-modern research similarly attempts to re-structure unequal power relations between researcher and those researched. Post-modern researchers will share of self with participants, show multiplicity of experience, illuminate participant voice, use CAP to share authority over interpretations with the audience, and highlight researcher subjectivity in final research projects. Post-modern research differs from critical research because while critical research has the purpose to critique or emancipate, post-modern research is better understood as research that attempts to deconstruct or expose power relations. Rather than attempt to emancipate through mass revolutions that equalize binary power structures, post-modernism instead wants to deconstruct (break down to analyze why/how something began) or expose power relations in order to dismantle binary systems—to open them up to multiple options, none being considered more valid or privileged than another. Therefore, post-modern research also tries to re-work the world to make it a more useful place for people to live, however, it will differ from critical research because it will try to create change not through emancipation or revolutions of change, but instead by asking people to “think differently” or re-consider. These re-deployments of thought or these “re-considerations” will help to create cracks in the foundations of status quo and slowly chip away at hegemonic ideologies or dominant discourses.

Very Basic Review for Intro to Qualitative Research in Education
Berbary 2012

Truth be told, post-modernism differs so greatly from most other ways of doing research that it is difficult to explain without having you all extensively read through post-modern theory. Understanding post-modernism requires taking on a whole new vocabulary and way of thinking. Fully grasping concepts like contingency, partial knowledges, performativity, discursive discipline, constituted subjectivities, regimes of truth, failures to repeat, and legitimation all require extensive reading. Therefore, I will tell you what I tell my on-campus students: Post-modernism is wonderful, yet it is difficult to grasp and takes time to understand. If you are interested in learning more, I suggest you begin by reading the article by my own professor, Dr. Bettie St. Pierre: *St. Pierre, E. A. (2000). Post-structural feminism in education: An overview. International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 13(5), 477-515.* This is a particularly well-written article that presents the best introduction to post-modernism (or post-structuralism, which is the academic theory that falls within post-modern thought) that I've seen.

In conclusion, critical research and post-modern research will not only look different from each other, but they will also look very different from basic interpretive research. Rather than simply understand, applying critical or post-modern lenses force research to "do" the work of changing understanding, exposing power, and creating difference in people's lived experiences. In this sense, I'd consider critical and post-modern research to be more activist and grounded in social justice. I hope that this type of research appeals to many of you so that you choose to conduct research with the specific intent of contributing to social change.

That completes the basic review. For those of you who plan to complete qualitative research project I suggest you take advanced qualitative courses and further your education through intense reading of qualitative literature. I have listed some of my favorite qualitative books for those of you who plan to go on to complete a qualitative dissertation:

- Burr, V. (1995). *An introduction to social constructionism*. London: Routledge.
- Crotty, M. (1998). *The foundations of social research: Meaning and perspective in the research process*. London: Sage Publications.
- DeMarrais, K. (2004). Qualitative interview studies: Learning through experience. In K. deMarrais & S.D. Lapan, (Eds.) *Foundations for research: Methods of inquiry in education and the social sciences* (pp. 51- 68). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2005). Introduction: The discipline and practice of qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 1-33). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Esterburg, K.G. (2002). *Qualitative methods in social research*. Boston, MA: McGraw Hill.
- Ezzy, D. (2002). *Qualitative analysis: Practice and innovation*. London: Routledge.
- Glover, T. D. (2007). Ugly on the diamonds: An examination of White privilege in youth baseball. *Leisure Sciences, 29*, 195-208.
- Johnson, C.W. & Samdahl, D.M. (2005). The night they took over: Misogyny in a country-western gay bar. *Leisure Sciences, 27*, 331-348.
- Kvale, S. (1996). *Interviews: An introduction to qualitative research interviews*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Very Basic Review for Intro to Qualitative Research in Education
Berbary 2012

- Lather, P. (1991). *Getting smart: Feminist research and pedagogy with/in the postmodern*. New York: Routledge.
- LeBlanc, L. (2000). *Pretty in punk: Girls' gender resistance in a boys' subculture*. New Jersey: Rutgers University Press.
- Maxwell, J.A. (1996). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Parry, D. C., & Johnson, C. W. (2007). Contextualizing leisure research to encompass complexity in lived leisure experience: The need for creative analytic practice. *Leisure Sciences*, 29, 119-130.
- Patton, M.Q. (2002). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Richardson, L. (1997). *Fields of play: Constructing an academic life*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Richardson, L. (2000). Evaluating ethnography. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 6, 253-255.
- Richardson, L., & St. Pierre, E. A. (2005). Writing: A method of inquiry. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 959-978). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- St. Pierre, E. A. (2000). Post-structural feminism in education: An overview. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 13(5), 477-515.
- St. Pierre, E.A. & Pillow W.S. (2000). Introduction: Inquiry among the Ruins. In E. A. S. Pierre & W. Pillow (Eds.), *Working the ruins: Feminist poststructural theory and methods in education* (pp. 1-24). New York: Routledge. (Original publication 1995.)
- Tedlock, B. (2003). Ehtnography and ethnographic representation. In N. K. Denzin, & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.) *Strategies of qualitative inquiry* (pp. 165-213). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Wolcott, H.F. (1994). *Transforming qualitative data: Description, analysis, and interpretation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Wolcott, H.F. (1999). *Ethnography: A way of seeing*. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.
- Olesen, V. L. (2005). Early millennial feminist qualitative research: Challenges and contours. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.) *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed., pp. 235-278). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Richardson, L. (1991). Postmodern social theory: Representational practices. *Sociological Theory*, 9(2), 173-179.
- Schwandt, T. (2001). *Dictionary of qualitative inquiry* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Villenas, S. (2000). The ethnography called my back: Writings of the exotic gaze, "othering" Latina, and recuperating Xicanisma. In E. A. St. Pierre & W. Pillow (Eds.), *Working the ruins: Feminist post-structural theory and methods in education* (pp. 27-40). New York: Routledge. (Original publication 1995).

Good luck in all of your future research endeavors! Keep learning, keep working, and keep reading!

Dr. Lisbeth A. Berbary
Contact: Laberbary@gmail.com