

Prosem in Management Seminar - MGMT 932
Qualitative Research Practicum - Part II
Fall 2020, Quarter 1 * Wednesday, 1.30 – 4.30 **except 12 – 3PM on 7 October*
<https://upenn.zoom.us/j/4105037374>

Professor: Lindsey Cameron

Office Hours: Immediately after class & By appt, please see [schedule link](#) in signature block

2027 SH-DH

ldcamer@wharton.upenn.edu

Go and sit in the lounges of the luxury hotels and on the doorsteps of flophouses; sit on the Gold Coast settees and the slum shakedown; sit in Orchestra Hall and in the Star and Garter Burlesque. In short, go get the seat of your pants dirty in real research.

~ Robert Park, founding father of American sociology

You have gone out and, in the words of Robert Park, “[gotten] the seat of your pants dirty in *real* research” either by conducting field research. Now what? This course is designed to help you figure that out.

As the second course in a two-part sequence introducing you to qualitative research, you will spend the quarter learning how to analyze your data and use it to write a strong findings section of a research paper suitable for eventual publication in an academic journal. The course has been structured around the idea that *qualitative data analysis is inextricably linked to the writing process*. That is, in qualitative research, to write is to analyze and to analyze is to write. You will thus be doing much writing this semester! In doing so, you will learn how to: identify luminous data; ask questions of your data; code; memo; develop an argument; situate the data in literature (and then re-frame it again and again); identify what additional data is needed; describe the scene, people, and place; use counts and negative cases; show variation; show not tell; and put the self in your writing. In addition, we will think about the ethical dilemmas of qualitative research that present themselves in the writing process.

Theoretically, we will consider questions such as the following (among many others): What is qualitative research? What is it best suited for? By what criteria does it meet or fail to meet the standards of scientific evidence? What are the roles of induction and deduction in qualitative research? How do we account for our own biases and perceptions in our research, turning them into a feature rather than a bug? Can qualitative research verify hypotheses, or only generate them? Can qualitative research explain social phenomena, or only interpret them? Do ethnographies have a small-N problem? In what ways is ethnographic research “grounded”? Is replicability possible in ethnographic or interview-based research? Is generalizability necessary? What are alternative ways of assessing empirical or theoretical significance? What are different ways to approach analysis?

Practically, we will consider questions such as the following: How does one go from hundreds of pages of field notes and transcripts to 20-page methods and finding section? How do you connect theory, research design, data collection, and data analysis? How do we analyze field notes and interview transcripts? What is coding? What are different frameworks to apply when coding data? How does one advance arguments? How does one write an ethnographic paper? What to include in a methods section? How does one begin theorizing a storyline from beginning to end of paper? How does one give a presentation based on interview data?

You do not have to have taken for the first part of this course, offered last Spring, to take this class, but you must have collected field data and, ideally, have already taken a research methods class (qualitative or quantitative). Data can be a mix of any qualitative (non-numerical) and quantitative data.

This course is open to masters and doctoral students in Management and closely related disciplines (e.g., sociology, communications, education). Please Email the instructor if you are interested in this course and do not fit into one of these categories.

Course Objectives:

In short, this course is organized with three objectives in mind:

1. Give you basic training in analyzing qualitative data, including exposure to multiple research paradigms and analytical strategies
2. Understand the issues and decisions involved in writing and presenting on qualitative data, including how to assess what is enough data and what is good data, making evidence claims, developing arguments, thinking through negative, and what are the limits of data.
3. Examine the ethical responsibilities of qualitative researchers. Understand how to comply with the IRB regulations and manage the approval process.

Course Policies:

1. Our weekly seminar will be discussion-based. We will begin with the discussion leader, who will provide the starting point for our discussion. I will also try to place the readings in context or to provide background information that will help frame the materials. There will also be a resource person each week.
2. Assignments are due at 11.59 pm the day before class. Assignments not received by the deadline will not receive personalized feedback and may possibly receive a deduction. Please be in conversation with me if you will be missing a deadline.
3. As you analyze your data you will experiment with different coding schemes and paradigms to find the best fit for your data. To that end, the readings of the class serve to give you broad exposure to different ways to think about and play with your data. As we can only cover so much in a three-hour class, I have included a list of recommended readings for every week so you can delve deeper into a specific topic if you so desire. All of these readings are optional. Finally, I have done my best to choose the most

comprehensive yet pithy articles for each topic area. However, I know for many of you this may be the first time covering these topics, some of which are quite dense, hence I will devote some time at the beginning of each class to provide an overview of the readings. I will also solicit feedback about what readings were most helpful.

4. The main component of the class involves analyzing your data that culminate into a methods/research proposal. I know that it takes much work and even more time to turn raw data into a coherent story and something that resembles a theoretical contribution and my intention is to support you in this journey.

5. I am excited to meet with you and to answer any questions about the course. I also would like to get to know you (if I don't know you already), to learn more about your interests and see how I can best help you so that we can learn together. To that end, please feel free to set up an appointment to meet. I will try to stay a few minutes after each class. If you have any "small" questions, then this will be an excellent time to approach me. I would like you to get as much out of the class as possible, so please do not hesitate to ask questions and to get feedback on your work.

6. I know staying focused during a three-hour Zoom class can be challenging. We will be taking breaks as well as having guest speakers, workshops, and break-out rooms. All students will also sign-up for **two** 20-minute workshop slots and shared 2-5 pages of writing with class 48 hours before class. Given the small class size, we may also end early some days.

7. On a logistical note, many researchers do not transcribe their interviews themselves. I often transcribe 2 - 3 in the beginning, to get a flavor of the data, and have the others professionally transcribe. Personally, I spread my interviews across multiple companies because sometimes companies take longer than originally promised.

Course Materials

All course materials can be found on Canvas or will be handed out in class.

Course Evaluations

Course evaluations are based on:

ASSIGNMENTS & GRADING

<i><u>Assignment*</u></i>	<i><u>Date Due</u></i>	<i><u>% of Grade**</u></i>
Class Participation		12
# 1 One-page memo on project, data, status of analysis	9/1	11
# 2 Open coding of data	9/9	11
#3 Identify 3 central themes & write 1-page memo on each	9/16	11

#4 Choose one theme & do focused coding	9/23	11
#5 Write integrative memo (5 pages)	9/30	11
#6 Expand integrative memo & identify research question (10 pages)	10/7	11
#7 Review of qualitative paper (2 - 4 pages, double spaces)	10/14	11
#8 Revise & expand integrative memo to a methods and findings section (15 - 20 pages)***	10/25	11

A note on turning in assignments and grading weights:

*Assignments should be submitted to Canvas by 11.59pm the day before each class. Any assignment received after the deadline will be graded but not receive feedback unless there has been a prior conversation.

** Given how each of the assignments below are equally important to the writing process each assignment has equal weight.

***The final paper is due by 11.59pm on 10/25 to be submitted on Canvas.

Week 1: Fundamentals of Field Research: Beginning to Bring it All Together

Week 2: Data Analysis: Exploring & Naming

Week 3: Data Analysis: Coding & Memoing

Week 4: Data Analysis: Heuristics & Frameworks

Week 5: Data Analysis: Claims, Evidence, & More Data

Week 6: The Writing Process: Theorizing the Storyline

Week 7: The Writing Process: Responding to Critiques

Week 1: Fundamentals of Field Research: Bringing it All Together

In this class, we will examine four basic elements of field research – the research question, the theory, the data, and the analysis of data – and consider the nature of the fit among them. In this class, we will complete an in-class exercise on open-coding. Bring to class a “holographic” piece of data — a fieldnote or portion of transcript that you feel best captures what you saw in the field — and come prepared to discuss why you find this data intriguing, your current research question and to tell us about the status of your data collection. Also, email me a copy of your favorite qualitative paper by the end of the first day of class.

Readings on Methodological Fit:

- Edmondson, A. C., & McManus, S. E. (2007). Methodological fit in management field research. *Academy of management review*, 32(4), 1155-1179.
- Eisenhardt, K. M. (1989). Building theories from case study research. *Academy of management review*, 14(4), 532-550.

Reading about using qualitative data to build theory:

- Becker, H. S. (1993). How I learned what a crock was. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 22(1), 28-35.
- Locke, K., Golden-Biddle, K., & Feldman, M. S. (2008). Perspective—Making doubt generative: Rethinking the role of doubt in the research process. *Organization science*, 19(6), 907-918.
- Pratt, M. G. (2009). From the editors: For the lack of a boilerplate: Tips on writing up (and reviewing) qualitative research. *Academy of Management Journal*.

Recommended Readings (All Recommended Readings are Optional):

- Dyer Jr, W. G., & Wilkins, A. L. (1991). Better stories, not better constructs, to generate better theory: A rejoinder to Eisenhardt. *Academy of management review*, 16(3), 613-619.
- Lin, A. C. (1998). Bridging positivist and interpretivist approaches to qualitative methods. *Policy studies journal*, 26(1), 162-180.
- Langley, A. (1999). Strategies for theorizing from process data. *Academy of Management review*, 24(4), 691-710.
- Pratt, M. G., Kaplan, S., & Whittington, R. (2020). Editorial Essay: The Tumult over Transparency: Decoupling Transparency from Replication in Establishing Trustworthy Qualitative Research. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 65(1), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0001839219887663>

In-Class:

- **Discussion Questions:** How can you tell if you have the right method for your research question? How do your research concerns and challenges differ when doing early versus late stage research? How does the fit of research method and question fit with academic and career temporal cycles? How can you use your understanding of fit to make your research interesting to others?
- **Exercise:** In-class coding exercise.
- **Other:** Come to class with your research question, your “Holographic” piece of Qualitative Data. Email your favorite qualitative paper to me by the end of the day.

Week 2: Exploring & Naming

While open coding is tedious it is one way to begin to really learn and embody your data. This week we will explore techniques to make coding “alive”.

Readings related to open coding of qualitative data:

- Armstrong Field Note on different ways to coding
- Becker, H.S. (1998) Concepts, Chapter 4 in *Tricks of the Trade: How to Think About your Research While You're Doing It*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press: 109-145.

- Charmaz, K. (2010) Chapter 3: *Coding in Grounded Theory Practice, Constructing Grounded Theory: A Practical Guide Through Qualitative Analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications: 42-71.
- Locke, K, Martha S.F and Golden-Biddle, Karen, (2016). Discovery, Validation and Live Coding. Forthcoming in Kimberly D. Elsbach & Roderick M. Kramer (eds) *Doing Innovative Qualitative Research in Organizations: Paths to Cool Ideas and Interesting Papers*. Organization and Management Series. Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group

Recommended readings on coding and analyzing field data:

- Silverman, D., and A. Marvasti (2008) Chapter 11: Beginning data analysis, and Chapter 12: Developing data analysis, *Doing Qualitative Research: A Comprehensive Guide*, Sage Publications: 189-256.
- Lamont. M. (1992) Appendix III and IV. *Money, Morals, and Manners: The Culture of the French and the American Upper-Middle Class*. Chicago: U. of Chicago Press. 217-231.
- Locke, (1996). Rewriting the discovery of grounded theory after 25 years? *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 5(3): 239–245.
- Silverman, D. (2007) Chapter 3 in A Very Short, Fairly Interesting and Reasonably Cheap Book about Qualitative Research, Sage Publications
- Spradley, James. 1979. Steps 5 and 6 of *The Ethnographic Interview*. Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Van, J. (1979) The fact of fiction in organizational ethnography, *Administrative Science Quarterly* (24): 539-550.

Assignment # 1: Open coding — turn in 2-3 pages of raw data and open codes

Week 3: Coding & Memoing

This week, we will begin moving from the open codes you developed in class last week to focused coding and memoing. Here, the emphasis in coding is on categorizing and fitting categories together so as to move toward telling a story or explaining a mechanism (in contrast to analyses that strive to test hypotheses).

Guest Speaker: Kevin Lee - PhD Candidate in Management, New York University

Readings on coding and analyzing field data:

- Charmaz, K. (2010) Chapter 4: Memo-writing, *Constructing Grounded Theory: A Practical Guide Through Qualitative Analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications: 72-95.
- Emerson, R., R. Fretz & L. Shaw (1995). Chapter 6: Processing fieldnotes: *Coding and memoing, Writing Ethnographic Fieldnotes*, University of Chicago.
- Grodal, S., Anteby, M., & Holm, A. L. (2020). Achieving Rigor in Qualitative Analysis: The Role of Active Categorization in Theory Building. *Academy of Management Review*, (ja).
- Suddaby, R. (2006) From the Editors: What grounded theory is not. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49(4): 633–642.

Recommended readings:

- Locke, K. (2001) Chapters 3 and 4 in *Grounded Theory in Management Research*. Sage.
- Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (2008). *Basics of Qualitative Research: Grounded Theory Procedures and Techniques 3rd edition*, Chapters 6-12. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage: 117-275

Assignment # 2: Identify 3 central themes from open codes & write 1-page memo on each (single space)

Week 4: Heuristics & Frameworks

This week we will explore using heuristics and framework as an analytic tool.

Guest Speaker: *Tiffany Johnson - Asst. Professor of Management, Georgia Institute of Technology*

Readings on heuristics and frameworks:

- Lofland, S, Anderson and Lofland. (2005) Chapter 9: Developing analysis, *Analyzing Social Settings: A Guide to Qualitative Observation and Analysis*: 195-219.
- Silverman, D., and A. Marvasti (2008) Chapter 7: Using theories, *Doing Qualitative Research: A Comprehensive Guide*: 129-142.
- Strauss, A. L. (1987) Discovering new theory from previous theory, *Appendix in Qualitative Analysis for Social Scientists*: 306-311.

Recommended Readings:

- Feldman, M. S. (1995). *Strategies for interpreting qualitative data* (Vol. 33). Sage.
- Ragin, C. C., & Becker, H. S. (Eds.). (1992). *What is a case?: exploring the foundations of social inquiry*. Cambridge university press.

Assignment #3: Choose one theme & do focused coding on this theme. Turn in 2-3 pages of raw data with focused codes and coding categories

Week 5: Claims, Evidence & More Data

This week we explore how build claims and more convincing stories from our data.

Guest Speaker: *Dana Kornberg - Asst Professor of Sociology, University of California, Santa Barbara*

Readings:

- *Class will choose two of the articles that were submitted in the first week we will read together*

- Duneier, M. (2006). Ethnography, the ecological fallacy, and the 1995 Chicago heat wave. *American Sociological Review*, 71(4), 679-688.
- Golden-Biddle, K., & Locke, K. (1993). Appealing work: An investigation of how ethnographic texts convince. *Organization science*, 4(4), 595-616.
- Harlan, Harley, B., & Cornelissen, J. (2020). Rigor With or Without Templates? The Pursuit of Methodological Rigor in Qualitative Research. *Organizational Research Methods*. You can find this paper in the folder "Files → Articles Not in Study.Net"
- Klinenberg, E. (2006). Blaming the victims: Hearsay, labeling, and the hazards of quick-hit disaster ethnography. *American Sociological Review*, 71(4), 689-698.

Recommended Readings of Other Analytical Perspectives:

- Glaser, B and Anselm, S. (1967) Chapter 5 - The constant comparative method of qualitative analysis in *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research*. Aldine de Gruyter
- Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. *Handbook of qualitative research*, 2(163-194), Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 105-117.
- Feldman, M. S., Sköldbberg, K., Brown, R. N., & Horner, D. (2004). Making sense of stories: A rhetorical approach to narrative analysis. *Journal of public administration research and theory*, 14(2), 147-170.
- Feldman, M. S., & Almquist, J. (2012). Analyzing the implicit in stories. *Varieties of narrative analysis*, 207-228.
- Hayes, G. R., Lee, C. P., & Dourish, P. (2011). Organizational routines, innovation, and flexibility: The application of narrative networks to dynamic workflow. *International journal of medical informatics*, 80(8), e161-e177.
- Janesick, V. J. (2001). Intuition and creativity: A pas de deux for qualitative researchers. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 7(5), 531-540.
- Klag, M., & Langley, A. (2013). Approaching the conceptual leap in qualitative research. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 15(2), 149-166.
- Lamont, M. (2009). Chapter 5 - *How professors think*. Harvard University Press, 159-201.
- Mantere, S., & Ketokivi, M. (2013). Reasoning in organization science. *Academy of management review*, 38(1), 70-89.
- Maitlis, Sally (2012) Narrative analysis. In: Symon, G. and Cassell, C., (eds.) *Qualitative Organizational Research: Core Methods and Current Challenges*, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, pp. 492-511. ISBN 978-0857024107.
- Maitlis, Sally (2012) Narrative analysis. In: Symon, G. and Cassell, C., (eds.) *Qualitative Organizational Research: Core Methods and Current Challenges*, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks 492-511.
- Patient, D., Lawrence, T. B., & Maitlis, S. (2003). Understanding workplace envy through narrative fiction. *Organization Studies*, 24(7), 1015-1044.
- Pentland, B. T., & Feldman, M. S. (2007). Narrative networks: Patterns of technology and organization. *Organization science*, 18(5), 781-795.
- Petriglieri, G. & Petriglieri, J.L. The return of the suppressed: A systems psychodynamic approach to organization studies. *Revise & Resubmit, Academy of Management Annals*

Assignment # 4: Write integrative memo of core theme (5 pages, double spaced)

Week 6: The Writing Process & Theorizing the Storyline

This week we will focus on building a theorizing storyline from our first sentence to our last. We will conduct several hands-on exercises to learn how to develop and write up theoretical arguments, including considering what to present up front versus in the discussion section.

Readings on the writing process:

- Belcher, W.L. “*Writing Your Journal Article in 12 Weeks: a Guide to Academic Success.*” Thousand Oaks; Sage; Strengthening your structure, pp. 171-188.
- Charmaz, K. (2010) Chapter 7: *Writing the Draft, Constructing Grounded Theory: A Practical Guide Through Qualitative Analysis.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications: 151-176.
- Golden-Biddle, Karen and Karen Locke. (2007) Introduction and Chapter 1: The Style and Practice of Our Academic Writing, *Composing Qualitative Research*: 1-24.
- Karl E. W.(1989) Theory construction as disciplined imagination. *Academy of Management Review*, 14(4): 516-531.

Recommended Readings on the writing process:

- Becker, H. (1986) *Writing for Social Scientists: How to Start and Finish Your Thesis, Book or Article.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Becker, H. S. (1998) Chapter 2: Imagery, *Tricks of the Trade: How to Think About your Research While You're Doing It.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press: 10-66.
- Gioia, D., K.G. Corley and A. Hamilton. (2013) Seeking qualitative rigor in inductive research: Notes on the Gioia methodology. *Organizational Research Methods* 16(1):15-31.
- Golden-Biddle, K. and K. Locke (2007) Chapter 2: Crafting a theorized storyline, Chapter 3: Developing the theorized storyline, *Composing Qualitative Research*: 25-60.
- Kamler, B., & Thomson, P. (2014). *Helping doctoral students write: Pedagogies for supervision.* Routledge.
 - *I cannot recommend this book highly enough!*
- Kilbourn, Brent. 2006. “The Qualitative Doctoral Dissertation Proposal.” *Teachers College Record* 108: 529-76.
- Richardson, Laurel. Writing: A Method of Inquiry. In Norman K. Denzin and Yvonna S. Lincoln (eds.) *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (Sage, 1994)
- Sword, Helen. (2017) *Air & Light & Time & Space: How Successful Academics Write.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

In-Class:

Discussion Questions: Which of the approaches to crafting a theoretical contribution identified in the Locke and Golden-Biddle (2007) article are you likely to use in your final paper for this course? Also, come prepared to discuss some of your favorite practices and techniques for writing.

Exercise: We will deconstruct the theoretical argument in one of the papers nominated by students at the beginning of the semester. I recommend picking one that uses the kind of argument you think you will use to frame the study you will write about in your final paper for the course. Examine in detail the

choices made by the authors regarding how to present a theoretical argument (sequence of paragraphs in the introductions) and how to connect the argument to the data (sequence of paragraphs in the discussion). Analyze, paragraph by paragraph, the structure of the argument and how the article is put together into sections, as well as within section. Consider these as small decisions made by the authors. You may find it useful to make an outline of the paragraphs' main points to better understand the structure of the argument. Did the authors use any of the four rhetorical moves identified by Locke and Golden-Biddle (2007) in the assigned chapters (2 and 3) above in the required text?

Assignment #5: Expand integrative memo & identify research question (10 pages, double spaced)

Week 7: Writing & Responding to Critiques

This week, you will have the opportunity to practice your journal-reviewing skills and to see how the journal-review process unfolds. We will take this opportunity to focus more explicitly on the paper-crafting-and-reviewing process by reading what scholars have written about these processes and by seeing an example.

Readings on crafting and reviewing papers:

- Cristiano, G. (2020). Tips for Writing a Review.
https://docs.google.com/document/d/18L0f1MCINu5m-iuzOi14Skgr_aUFCdOI/edit
- Daft, R.L. (1995) Chapter 9: Why I recommended that your manuscript be rejected and what you can do about it, L.L. Cummings and P. Frost (Eds.), *Publishing in the Organizational Sciences*: 164-182.
- Locke, K and K,Golden-Biddle. (1997) Constructing opportunities for contribution: Structuring intertextual coherence and ‘problematizing’ in organizational studies, *Academy of Management Journal*. 40(5):1023-1062.
- Ragins, B. R. (2015). Editor's comments: Developing our authors. *Academy of Management Review*. You can find this paper in the folder “Files → Articles Not in Study.Net”
- **Paper to review:** Cameron, L. Alliance or Adversaries ? Original submission to Organization Science. You can find this paper in the folder “Files → Articles Not in Study.Net”

Recommended readings on validity & reviewing:

- Bagozzi, R., Y. Yi, and L. Phillips, (1991). Assessing construct validity in organizational research, *Administrative Science Quarterly*. (36): 421-458.
- Campbell, D. T. and Fiske, D. (1959) Convergent and discriminant validation by the multi trait-multimethod matrix, *Psychological Bulletin* (56): 81-105.
- Cook, T. D., and D. T. Campbell (1979). Chapter 2: Validity, Quasi-Experimentation: Design and Analysis Issues for Field Settings. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin: 37-94. Editorial. (1993) Article review checklist: A criterion checklist for reviewing research articles in applied psychology, *Personnel Psychology* (46): 705-718.
- Duneier, M. (2011). How not to lie with ethnography. *Sociological Methodology*, 41(1), 1-11.

- Pratt, M. G. (2000) Some thoughts on publishing qualitative research, Research Methods Forum Vol. 5.

Recommended readings on reviewing:

- Grimes, M. (2020). Matthew Grimes One-Page Reviewing
Scheme:https://docs.google.com/document/d/1ZEd0TfTsP4h_TUdz8LLM4dZefb4uRNdW4skjepJ2C1U/edit
- Leblebici, H. (1996). The act of reviewing and being a reviewer. *Rhythms of academic life: Personal accounts of careers in academia*, 269-274.
- Romanelli, E. (1996). Becoming a reviewer: Lessons somewhat painfully learned. *Rhythms of academic life: Personal accounts of careers in academia*, 263-268.
- Zuckerman, E.W. (2008) “Tips for Article-Writers”
<http://web.mit.edu/ewzucker/www/Tips%20to%20article%20writers.pdf>

In-Class:

Discussion Questions: What did you think of the reviewers’ comments? How did they compare with your comments? What did you think of the changes made? How did construct clarity, support and the framing of novelty improve? How were relationships between constructs established? What makes a good review? What does this experience teach you about being a good reviewer for others? Having seen the whole review process for this paper, what do you take away as lessons about the journal-reviewing process?

Assignment #6: Read paper for review and write review (2 - 4, single spaced pages). After you have turned in your review, you will receive an electronic copy of the actual reviews of this paper, the editorial letter and the revision.. Please read these materials and come to class prepared to discuss them in class.

Assignments #7: Revise & expand integrative memo to a findings section (15 - 20 pages, double spaced); due date is 5PM one week from the last day of class