

GENERAL FEEDBACK ON YOUR RPs

- Acknowledgement. Besides thanking participants involved, remember to credit fellow group members if you are drawing on this preliminary work in your master.
- In what way is your study interesting/relevant? (un-researched, raises new questions about a topic, previous research is ambiguous?)
- Research question(s) - what kind of knowledge do you seek and how do the methodology + methods support your inquiry?
- Paradigm?
- Methodology: e.g. an ethnographic study or a case study specify what it entails and justify your choice.
- Strengths / weakness about the method(s) + how they support each other
- If you use interview... specify: what kind, who, how long, where (also describe the setting, e.g. artifacts present/used during the interview?), how come? Give some thought to how you would transcribe your interviews – verbatim, with summaries?
- If you do observation... specify: what kind, who, where, how long, how come?
- The same goes for documents (specify which kind(s), from where (+ date?))
- Photos? Explain in what way they support your study, what are they meant to be, how were they constructed (set up); take notes on impressions at the time of the photo; do they need text to be understood by others?
- What about analysis of data? Are you (planning to do) coding (GT)? Are you writing memos? Themes? Concepts e.g. from HCI, CSCW, CSCL? Are you able to write a short paragraph?
- Verify your statements either with references, or 'I/we believe' and/or 'I/we assume'.
- What have you learned? (methodologies, methods?, research topic? something about your bias(s), your positioning/relation in the field? representation? Other concerns of ethics)
- Insert references (Author(s) Year Page(s)) to literature, figures, tables, photos, etc. whenever you quote or refer. Also, remember the bibliography in which all references used should be listed. See link on course page in "Messages" for link to a manual on the Harvard Style.

ANALYZING EMPIRICAL MATERIAL

What is analysis?

- * Breaking something down into smaller parts to gain new/different understanding(s) (Maunter 2005)
- * To make formal sense of empirical material generated through fieldwork by reconsidering it, looking at it carefully and critically (Crang & Cook 2007:133).
- * Translating a messy process into a neat product (Ibid.)

Analyzing field material you can ask the following questions:

- *What are people doing? What are they trying to accomplish?
- *How, exactly, do they do this? What specific means and/or strategies do they use?
- *How do members talk about, characterize, and understand what is going on?
- *What assumptions are they making?
- *What do I see going on here? What did I learn from these notes?
- *Why did I include them? (Emerson et al. 1995:146)

VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY IN RESEARCH

- * *Credibility* of the account (i.e. authenticated representation of what actually occurred)
- * *Transferability* of the material (i.e. making what occurred intelligible to the audience)
- * *Dependability* of the interpretation (i.e. that it is not illogical, or how partisan it is) and
- * *Conformability* of the study (i.e. the ability to review the process that made it through personal reflection, opportunities for informants to respond) (Crang & Cook 2007)
- * Triangulation (method, multi ways of investigating situations and/or outcome) (Silverman 2005. See also Crang & Cook 2007:128) ¹

Besides GT other approaches to analysis:

- * **Conversation Analysis** (ethnomethodology – naturally occurring conversations – the social world is not orderly, it's dynamic – how order is established in (inter-)action))
- * **Discourse Analysis** (interviews, observation, documents, video/audio – The social world is produced by and produces objects/subjects/phenomena - "How does discourse function? Where is it to be found? How does it get produced and regulated? What are its social effects? How does it exist?" (Ricardson & St. Pierre 2005:969).
(Atkinson & Delamont 2005 + Ricardson & St. Pierre 2005 + Peräkylä 2005)

¹ For a critical account on Triangulation see the Ricardson & St. Pierre 2005:963.

GROUNDED THEORY

* GT is both an inquiry and the product of the inquiry – it's an analytical guideline that helps focus the data collection, build theories, and develop concepts (The Handbook:507)

*“data collection, analysis, and theory stand in reciprocal relationship with each other. One does not begin with a theory, then proves it. Rather, one begins with area of study and what is relevant to that area is allowed to emerge” (Strauss & Corbin 1990, in Thoresen).

*“Grounded theorists give priority to developing rather than verifying analytical propositions” (Emerson, Fretz, Shaw, 1995:143)

*Theory should be grounded – “to take an existing (...) theory or a set of pre-defined concepts as point of departure (...) is a risky endeavor. It means that an external structure is imposed on the data.” (Thoresen)

That is, rather take predefined concepts and explore them in the field settings to see if, how, when, and to what extent the concepts are relevant to the study: **“we need to treat concepts as problematic and look for their characteristics as lived and understood, not as given in the textbook”** (Charmaz 2005:512)

*Difference between *substantive* (single context) and *formal* theory (similar phenomena occur in different context)

METHODS:

- * Interviews
- * Filmic approaches
- * Observation
- * Code
- * Memos
- * Asking questions

CRITIQUE OF GT

- We bring theory to the field - data do not stand alone, analysis unfolds in all phases of field research (observations, when recording fieldnotes, when coding the notes in analytical categories, and when developing theoretical propositions). Emerson et al. (1995)
- A systematic coding of data does not (in itself) lead to theory - the bibliography of the researcher plays a role in the analysis - data do not talk and reveal. Thagaard (1998)²

² Literature not listed in syllabus:

Group work

- What are the main characteristics of grounded theory?
- Within grounded theory it's important to generate theory that is grounded - how come?
- How would you gather empirical material if you set out to do a study using grounded theory?
- How would you analyze your empirical material?
- Do grounded theory and case studies relate to each other? How? And, what about ethnography?
- Paradigm?

Atkinson, P. & Delamont, S. (2005): Analytical Perspectives. In Denzin, N. K. & Linkoln, Y. S. (eds.): *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Sage Publications.

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

Maunterm, T. (2005): *The Penguin Dictionary of Philosophy*. Penguin Books.

Peräkylä, A. (2005): Analyzing Talk and Text. In Denzin, N. K. & Linkoln, Y. S. (eds.): *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Sage Publications.

Ricardson, L. & St. Pierre, E., A. (2005): Writing: A Method of Inquiry. In Denzin, N. K. & Linkoln, Y. S. (eds.): *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Sage Publications.

Silverman, D. (2005): *Doing Qualitative Research*. Sage.

Thagaard, T. (1998): *Systematikk og innlevelse. En innføring i kvalitativ metode*. Fagbogforlaget