

**Mgt 661: Seminar in Qualitative Research Methods**  
**New Mexico State University**  
**Spring 2007**  
**Mondays, 2:30 – 5:00, Room BC 247**

**Professor:**

Michael R. Manning  
Department of Management  
Business Complex, Room 321  
Office Phone: 646-2532  
[mmanning@nmsu.edu](mailto:mmanning@nmsu.edu)

**Description and Overview:**

This seminar will focus on the qualitative approach to designing social and organizational research. It will build upon the work started in the Quantitative Research Methods seminar. Qualitative research/methodology has a long and distinguished history in the human disciplines. In sociology the work of the “Chicago School” in the 1920s and 1930s established the importance of qualitative research for the study of human group life. In Anthropology, during the same period, the pathbreaking studies of Boas, Mead, Benedict, Bateson, Evans-Pritchard, Radcliffe-Brown, and Malinowski characterized the outlines of the fieldwork method (ethnography), wherein the observer went to a foreign setting to study the customs and habits of another society and culture. Soon, qualitative research was employed in other social science disciplines such as linguistics, literary studies, education, social work, communications, and the management and organizational sciences.

In basic terms, Qualitative Methods is a detailed description of situations, events, people, and behaviors. It includes what people say about their experiences, attitudes, beliefs, and thoughts through recordings, documents, transcripts, records, and narrative histories. Qualitative data sources include observation and participant observation, fieldwork, interviews, texts, and the researcher's diary of impressions and reactions. Qualitative methods are typically open-ended and do not impose, outsider, expert, academic, predetermined, categories (called Etic categories) such as the response choices that comprise typical questionnaires or tests. Instead qualitative methods begin with observations and conversations (interviews, etc.) about people's grounded, “real life” experiences (called Emic categories) and move toward building theory to help illuminate, explain, and extend those experiences.

Qualitative research is a field of inquiry in its own right. It crosscuts disciplines, fields, and subject matter. The philosophical roots of qualitative research/methodology span multiple schools of thought such as phenomenology, critical theory, post-structuralism, hermeneutics, feminism, deconstructionism, psychoanalysis, interpretivism, post-positivism, postmodernism, and social constructionism. In terms of methods, qualitative researchers use semiotics, narrative, content, discourse, archival and phonemic analysis, and sometimes even statistics. They also

draw upon and utilize the approaches, methods, and techniques of ethnomethodology, ethnographies, interviews, survey research and participant observation among others.

The following is a convenient and simple classification with which to approach qualitative methods:

**Research strategies:**

- Case study,
- Ethnography,
- Participant observation,
- Phenomenology,
- Ethnomethodology,
- Grounded theory,
- Biographical method,
- Historical method,
- Action and applied research,
- Clinical research
- Generative Theory

**Methods of data collection and analysis:**

- Interviewing,
- Observing,
- Collecting artifacts, documents and records,
- Visual methods such as photographs, filming and video-taping,
- Personal experience and methods,
- Data management methods,
- Computer assisted analysis,
- Textual analysis,
- Storytelling and other narrative approaches

The seminar is intended to provide students an overview and experience of qualitative methods. We will to the extent possible try and cover the major traditions associated with qualitative research and theory building during the semester. However, the major thrust of this seminar will be on developing an understanding of the ‘grounded theory’ methodology which in our opinion is an approach that cuts across several traditions of qualitative research. Grounded theory in combination with methods of data collection and analysis such as interviews, participant observation and analytical techniques such as the constant comparative method under girds several other forms of inquiry such as ethnography, biography, phenomenology, action research, and case-study approaches.

In addition to learning *about* qualitative methods, we will *do* them. The overarching goal of this seminar is to establish a forum to learn the “craft” of qualitative organizational research and its associated technologies so as to help you acquire the skills necessary in undertaking your dissertation-related research from a qualitative perspective. Reading methods texts and exemplary journal articles is crucial in this regard, but it is not sufficient. In order to understand

fully the intricacies and complexities of qualitative research, you have to go out and do it. This course will be structured to help you accomplish this. A broad overview includes:

- Introduction to Qualitative Methods
- Strategies of Qualitative Inquiry
- Methods of Collecting Qualitative Data

As we proceed you will be asked to go out and do at least three episodes (days if possible) of Participant Observation (with field notes) and three Qualitative Interviews.

- Analysis of Exemplary Qualitative Research
- Methods of Analyzing Qualitative Data
- The Art of Coding and First Order Interpretation

You will then be asked to code your field notes and interview transcripts, to identify categories and themes, and to write up a first order interpretation of the data.

- Second Order Analysis and Theory Building
- Writing Up Qualitative Research
- Publishing Qualitative Research

To conclude the seminar we will focus on second order analysis, theory building, and writing and publishing qualitative research. You will be asked to develop your qualitative research into a theoretical contribution and to write it up (maybe to be published).

### **Seminar Design and Readings**

During the first part of the seminar we will focus on the development and increased understanding of three themes around qualitative methods: introduction to qualitative methods, strategies of qualitative inquiry (specifically case studies, ethnography, phenomenology, action research, and grounded theory), and methods of data collection (specifically interviewing and participant observation).

The readings reflect both philosophical/epistemological themes and practical applications. **Please read all of the articles and book chapters that are assigned.** It will be a lot of reading, but the readings are specifically selected to give you a firm understanding of the central methods of qualitative research. Reading them will allow you to know what your options are so that you can begin making choices and designing your dissertation research *now* (if you wish). **Be sure that you read the assigned page numbers.**

I'm not sure how readings will be assigned and if specific participants will present and/or facilitate class discussions. We will decide during the first class how we will structure our process.

\* Readings marked with an asterisk are exemplars of the methods being discussed. When reading these articles, pay particular attention to the discussion of the methodology and the way the article is structured and crafted.

At the completion of the seminar you will orally present your research to the seminar and provide me with a written report.

In the first classes we will discuss the history and basic characteristics of qualitative methods and the different paradigms and perspectives that currently represent the field.

### **Some Beginning Ideas: The Case For/Against Qualitative Methods**

Argyris, C. 1968. Some Unintended Consequences of Rigorous Research. *Psychological Bulletin*, 185-197.

Gergen, K. 1973. Social Psychology as History. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 309-319.

Daft, D. and Lewin, A. 1990. Can Organization Studies Begin to Break Out of the Normal Science Straitjacket? An Editorial Essay. *Organization Science*, 1-9.

Greenfield, T.B. 1986. The Decline and Fall of Science in Educational Administration. *Interchange*, 57-90.

Sherwood, J.J. and Nataupsky, M. 1968. Predicting the Conclusions of Negro-White Intelligence Research from Biographical Characteristics of the Investigator. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 53-58.

Van Maanen, J. 1979. Reclaiming Qualitative Methods for Organizational Research: A Preface. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 520-526.

Behling, O. 1980. The Case for the Natural Science Model for Research in Organizational Behavior and Organization Theory. *Academy of Management Review*, 483-490.

Morgan, G. and Smircich, L. 1980. The Case for Qualitative Research. *Academy of Management Review*, 491-500.

Martin, J. 1990. Breaking up the Mono-Method Monopolies in Organizational Analysis. In Hassard, J. and Denis, P. *The Theory and Philosophy of Organizations: Critical Issues and New Perspectives*. 30-43.

Donaldson, L. 1997. A Positivist Alternative to the Structure – Action Approach. *Organization Studies*. 18 (1), 77-92.

Bartunek, J.M., Rynes, S.L., and Ireland, R.D. 2006. What Makes Management Research Interesting and Why Does It Matter? *Academy of Management Journal*, 49, 9-15.

Elbow, P. 1973. The Doubting-Game and Believing Game. In *Writing Without Teachers*, Oxford Press.

Additional Readings:

Gould, S.J. 1983. *The Mismeasure of Man*.

### **Introduction to Qualitative Methods**

Denzin, N. K. & Lincoln, Y. S. 2000. Introduction: The discipline and practice of qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.) *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, pp. 1-28.

Lincoln, Y. S. & Guba, E. G. 2000. Paradigmatic controversies, contradictions, and emerging confluences. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.) *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, pp. 163-188.

Schwandt, T. A. 2000. Three epistemological stances for qualitative inquiry: Interpretivism, hermeneutics, and social construction. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.) *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, pp. 189-213.

Evered, R., & Louis, M. R. 1981. Alternative perspectives in the organizational sciences: "Inquiry from the inside" and "inquiry from the outside." *Academy of Management Review*, 6, 385-395.

Gephardt, R.P., Jr. 2004. Qualitative Research and the Academy of Management Journal. *Academy of Management Journal*, 47, 454-462.

Das, T.H. 1983. Qualitative research in organizational behaviour. *Journal of Management Studies*, 20, 3, 1983.

Glaser, B., & Strauss, A. 1967. Ch. 1: "The Discovery of Grounded Theory," in *The Discovery of Grounded Theory*, pp. 1-18.

### **Strategies of Qualitative Inquiry**

We will review five of the major approaches to qualitative research: case studies, ethnography, phenomenology, grounded theory, and action research.

#### **1. Case Studies**

Lee, T. W. 1998. Case study research. In *Using Qualitative Methods in Organizational Research* (pp. 54-61). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Eisenhardt, K. M. 1989. Building theories from case study research. *Academy of Management Review*, 14, 532-550.

Dyer, W. G. Jr., & Wilkins, A. L. 1991. Better stories, not better constructs, to generate better theory: A rejoinder to Eisenhardt. *Academy of Management Review*, 16, 613-619.

Eisenhardt, K. M. 1991. Better stories and better constructs: The case for rigor and comparative logic. *Academy of Management Review*, 16, 620-627.

\*Dutton, J. E., & Dukerich, J. M. 1991. Keeping an eye on the mirror: Image and identity in organizational adaptation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 34, 517-554.

\*Weick, K. E. 1993. The collapse of sensemaking in organizations: The Mann Gulch disaster. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 38, 628-652.

\*Bartunek, J. M. 1984. Changing interpretive schemes and organizational restructuring: The example of a religious order, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 29, 355-372.

\*Kahn, W. A. 1999. Caring for the caregivers: Patterns of organizational caregiving. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 38, 539-563.

\*Brown, S.L. and Eisenhardt, K.M. 1997. The Art of Continuous Change: Linking Complexity Theory and Time-paced Evolution in Relentlessly Shifting Organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 42, 1-34.

## **2. Ethnography and Participant Observation**

Lee, T. W. 1998. Participation and Observation. In *Using Qualitative Methods in Organizational Research* (pp. 98-101). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Atkinson, P. & Hammersley, M. 1994. Ethnography and participant observation. In Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.) *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (1<sup>st</sup> Ed.) (pp. 248-261). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Van Maanen, J. 1979. The fact of fiction in organizational ethnography. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 24, 539-550.

\*Sutton R. I & Hargadon, A. 1996. Brainstorming groups in context: Effectiveness in a product design firm. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41, 685-718.

\*Poole, P. P., Gioia, D. A., & Gray, B. 1989. Influence modes, schema change, and organizational transformation. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 25, 3, 271-289.

Whyte, W. F. 1979. On making the most of participant observation. *The American Sociologist*, 14, 56-66.

Webb, E., & Weick, K. 1979. Unobtrusive measures in organizational theory: A reminder. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 24, 650-659.

\*Barker, J. 1993. "Tightening the Iron cage: Concertive control in self-managing teams". *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 38, 408-437.

\*Rosen, M. 1988. "You asked for it: Christmas at the bosses expense" *Journal of Management Studies*, 25, 5, 463-480.

\*Roy, D. F. "Banana Time" Job satisfaction and informal interaction, *Human Organization*, ?, 158-168.

\*Geertz, C. 1973. Deep Play: Notes on the Balinese Cockfight.

### 3. Phenomenology and Interpretive Practice

Gubrium, J. F. & Holstein, J. A. 2000. Analyzing interpretive practice. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.) *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, pp. 163-188.

\*Barley, S. R. 1983. Semiotics and the study of occupational and organizational cultures. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 28, 393-413.

\*Gioia, D. A., Thomas, J. B., Clark, S. & Chittipedi, K. (1994). Symbolism and strategic change in academia: The dynamics of sensemaking and influence, *Organization Science*, 5(3), 363.

\*Isabella, L. (1990). Evolving interpretations as a change unfolds: How managers construe key organizational events, *Academy of Management Journal*, 33(1), 7-41.

\*Jehn, K. 1997. A qualitative analysis of conflict types and dimensions of Organizational groups. *Administrative Science Quarterly*.

\*Fiol, C. M. 1989. A semiotic analysis of corporate language: Organizational boundaries and joint venturing. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 34, 277-303.

\*Geertz, C. 1973. Deep Play: Notes on the Balinese Cockfight.

Perlow, L.A. 1999. The Time Frame: Toward a Sociology of Work Time. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44,57-81.

#### 4. Grounded Theory

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. 1967. *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research* (pp. 101-116). New York: Aldine de Gruyter. For now, read Chapters 1 (The Discovery of Grounded Theory) and 5 (The Constant Comparative Method of Qualitative Analysis).

This book is a classic in sociology. It lays out a method for inductive discovery of theory from the ground up. It treats grounded theory as a craft. In order to fully appreciate the thrust of the argument in this book, it is important to understand the historical context in which it was written, and one that is still relevant today. At the time of the writing, the inductive generation of theory was not seen as a legitimate research activity compared to logical positivistic approaches. Also, qualitative data was seen as inferior to quantitative data. The book challenges the canon that research should only be concerned with accuracy and verification. Glaser and Strauss argue that the rules for what counts as evidence hinder creative discovery and the potential development of important theories. If we do not challenge this canon, Glaser and Strauss contend, we will be limited to verifying the theories of a few “great persons” who preceded us such as Weber, Durkheim and Marx. This book is significant to the field of inquiry. It stands as a challenge for researchers to stay alive and open to surprise at a time when they might be tempted to eliminate ambiguity and settle for premature closure. We will return to this book later in the Qualitative Methods course.

Locke, K. 1996. Rewriting the discovery of grounded theory after 25 years? *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 5, 239-245.

Locke, K. 2001. *Grounded Theory in Management Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Turner, B.A. 1983. The use of grounded theory for the qualitative analysis of organizational behavior. *Journal of Management Studies*, 20 (3), 333-348.

Suddaby, R. 2006. From the Editors: What Grounded Theory is Not. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49, 633-642.

\*Gersick, C. J. G., Bartunek, J. M., Dutton, J. E. 2000. Learning from academia: The importance of relationships in professional life. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43, 1026-1044.

\*Isabella, L. (1990). Evolving interpretations as a change unfolds: How managers construe key organizational events, *Academy of Management Journal*, 33(1), 7-41.

\*Fox-Wolfgramm, S. J., Boal, K. B., Hunt, J. G. 1998. Organizational adaptation to institutional change: A comparative study of first-order change in prospector and defender banks. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 43, 87-126.

\*Sutton, R.I. 1987. The Process of Organizational Death: Disbanding and Reconnecting. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 32, 542-569.

## 5. Action Research

\*Pasmore, W. and Friedlander, F. 1982. An Action-Research Program for Increasing Employee Involvement in Problem Solving. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 27, 343-362.

Boog, B.W.M. 2003. The Emancipatory Character of Action Research, its History and the Present State of the Art. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 13, 426-438.

Martin, A.W. 2004. Building an Internal Mediation System: An Action Research Case. Academy of Management Best Conference Paper 2004 ODC, 1-7.

Argyris, C. 1973. Chapter One: The Primary Tasks of Intervention Activities. *Intervention Theory and Method*. pp. 12-35.

Eden, C. and Huxham, C. 1996. Action Research for the Study of Organizations. In Clegg, S.R., Hardy, C. and Nord, W.R. *Handbook of Organization Studies*. Sage Publications: Thousand Oaks, California, 526-542.

Burnes, B. 2004. Kurt Lewin and the Planned Approach to Change: A Re-appraisal. *Journal of Management Studies*, 41, 977-1002.

Reid, C. 2004. Advancing Women's Social Justice Agendas: A Feminist Action Research Framework. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 3, 1-22.

\*Halbesleben, J.R.B., Osborn, H.K. and Mumford, M.M. 2006. Action Research as a Burnout Intervention: Reducing Burnout in the Federal Fire Service. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*.

\*Kowalski, R., Harmon, J. Yorks, L., Kowalski, D. \_\_\_\_\_. Reducing Workplace Stress and Aggression: An Action Research Project at the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs. *Human Resource Planning*, 39-53.

\* Manning, M.R. & DelaCerde Gastélum, J. 2003. Building organizational change in an emerging economy: Whole systems change using large group interventions in

Mexico. In Woodman R.W. and Pasmore, W.A. (Eds.), Research in Organizational Change and Development (Vol. 14), Kidlington, Oxford, UK: Elsevier Science: 51-97.

### **Methods of Collecting Data: Interviewing and Participant Observation**

We will discuss two main data collection methods, interviewing and participant observation. While it is difficult to develop mastery over these methods in just a semester, we will spend some time developing skills in each of these areas. To prepare for this discussion, please read the following book chapters.

Spradley, J. P. *Participant Observation*. Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace (pp. 1-84).

“Ethnography starts with a conscious attitude of almost complete ignorance” (p. 4). Well, since the postmodern turn, we know that this is naïve and impossible. Nevertheless, as a useful guide to the methods of ethnography and field work, Spradley introduces the notion that we need to train ourselves to notice the rich tapestry of social life that we have learned to ignore. He introduces the idea of observation as a discipline that requires focused practice. Even though this book is typically used to accompany the researcher while engaged in ethnography through Spradley’s proposed sequence, it is a very useful way of conceptualizing the entire cyclical research process. A most useful aspect of this book is the developmental sequence from general to more focused observation and the interplay between field notes taken soon after observation and the evolution of later concepts. Most important, pay attention to Spradley’s description of field notes. Taking good field notes is indispensable. Also, the book cites a number of interesting sociological studies that use ethnographic methods.

Rubin, H. J. & Rubin, I. S. *Qualitative Interviewing: The Art of Hearing Data*. Thousand Oaks: Sage (pp. 1-16; pp. 93-225).

This book is a good introduction to interviewing and provides an easy read. It distinguishes between different kinds of interviews suitable for different purposes. The book should serve as a useful reference as your research proceeds. You will notice that the authors draw upon the work of Glaser and Strauss and go beyond discussing the interviewing as mere technique to discuss the process of inquiry and building concepts and theories throughout the data collection process. The early chapters on topic choice may be more relevant for some than others. The chapters on creating conversational partnerships (chpt. 6) and structuring the interview, especially the issue of probes following main questions, should be helpful for those who intend to use interview data. Chpt. 9 on topical interviewing might be relevant for those who are using interviews for very focused topics and research questions.

## **Biographical, Autobiographical, and Historical Methods**

Smith, L. M. 1994. Biographical method. In Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.) *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (1<sup>st</sup> Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage pp. 286-305.

\*Bennis, W. 1991. Autobiography – Part 1: An Inventory Life: Shoe Polish, Milli Vanilli, and Sapiential Circles. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 27, 413-424.

\*Alderfer, C.P. 1989. Theories Reflecting My Personal Experience and Life Development. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 25, 351–265.

Tuchman, G. 1994. Historical social science: Methodologies, methods, and meanings. Biographical method. In Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.) *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (1<sup>st</sup> Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage pp. 306-323.

\*Hargadon, A. B. & Douglas, Y. 2001. When innovations meet institutions: Edison and the design of the electric light. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 46, 476-501.

\*Ronai, C.R. 1992 The Reflexive Self Through Narrative: The Night in the Life of an Erotic Dancer. In Ellis and Flaherty (Eds), *Investigating Subjectivity Research on Lived Experience*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

\*Kiesinger, C.E. 1998. From Interview to Story: Writing Abbie's Life. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 4, 71-95.

## **Methods of Collecting and Analyzing Qualitative Data**

Huberman, A. M. & Miles, M. B. 1994. Data management and analysis methods. In Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.) *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (1<sup>st</sup> Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, pp. 428-444.

Harper, D. 2000. Reimagining visual methods: Galileo to Neuromancer. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.) *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, pp. 717-732.

Ellis, C. & Bochner, A. P. 2000. Autoethnography, personal narrative, reflexivity: Researcher as subject. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.) *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, pp. 733-768.

Weitzman, E. A. 2000. Software in qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.) *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, pp. 803-820.

Silverman, D. 2000. Analyzing talk and text. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.) *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, pp. 821-834.

### **Longitudinal Research and Working with Process Data**

Van de Ven, A., & Poole, M. S. (1990). Methods for studying innovation development in the Minnesota Innovation Research Program. *Organization Science*, 1: 313-335.

Van de Ven, A., & Huber, G. 1990. Longitudinal Field Research Methods for Studying Processes of Organizational Change. *Organization Science*, 1, 213-219.

Pettigrew, A. M. 1990. Longitudinal field research on change: Theory and practice. *Organization Science*, 1, 267-292.

Barley, S. R. 1990. Images of imaging: Notes on doing longitudinal field work. *Organization Science*, 1, 220-247.

Langley, A. 1999. Strategies for theorizing from process data. *Academy of Management Review*, 24(4), 691-710.

Pentland, B. T. 1999. Building process theory with narrative: From description to explanation. *Academy of Management Review*, 24, 711-724.

Smith, A. D. 2002. From process data to publication: A personal sensemaking. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 11(4), 383-406.

\*Pratt, M. G. 2000. The good, the bad, and the ambivalent: Managing identification among Amway distributors. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 45, 456-493.

\*Ely, R. J. & Thomas, D. A. 2001. Cultural diversity at work: The effects of diversity perspectives on work group processes and outcomes. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 46, 229-273.

\*Perlow, L. A. 1999. The time famine: Toward a sociology of work time. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44, 57-81.

### **Coding and Analyzing Field Data in the Grounded Theory Tradition**

Strauss, A & Corbin, J. 1998. *Basics of qualitative research (second edition)*. Thousand Oaks: Sage (Chapters 1-12).

This book is the practical companion to Glaser and Strauss's Grounded Theory. It walks you through the steps of doing a grounded theory, including getting started; how to use the

literature; how to do open, axial, and selective coding; how to create “working diagrams,” memos, and models; and how to build good, robust, compelling theory. For any of you who will be doing a qualitative dissertation of any kind (even if it is combined with quantitative), this book is an extremely useful tool.

### **Generative Theory**

Gergen, K.J. 1978. Toward generative theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 36, 11, 1244-1360.

Johnston, C. 1986. Aliveness. *The creative imperative*.

Tillich, P. 1965. Critique and justification of utopia.

\*Cameron, K.S. 2003. Organizational virtuousness and performance. In K.S. Cameron, J.E. Dutton, & R.E. Quinn (Eds.), *Positive organizational scholarship*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

\*Fredrickson, B.L. 2003. Positive emotions and upward spirals in organizations. In K.S. Cameron, J.E. Dutton, & R.E. Quinn (Eds.), *Positive organizational scholarship*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

### **Perspectives on Theory Building**

Whetten, D.A. 1989. What constitutes a theoretical contribution? *Academy of Management Review*, 14, 4, 490-495.

Weick, K.E. 1989. Theory construction as disciplined imagination. *Academy of Management Review*, 14, 4, 516-531.

Sutton, R.I. & Staw, B.M. 1995. What theory is not. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 40, 371-384.

Weick, K.E. 1995. What theory is not, theorizing is. *Administrative Sciences Quarterly*, 40, 385-390.

McKinley, W., Mone, M.A., & Moon, G. 1999. Determinants and development of schools in organization theory. *Academy of Management Review*, 24, 4, 634-648.

Weick, K.E. 1999. Theory construction as disciplined reflexivity: Tradeoffs in the 90s. *Academy of Management Review*, 24, 4, 797-806.

### **The Practice of Building Theory**

Dubin, R. 1976. Theory building in applied areas. In M.D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 17-39). Chicago: Rand McNally.

Poole, M.S. & Van de Ven, A. 1989. Using paradox to build management and organization theories. *Academy of Management Review*, 14, 4, 562-578.

Folger, R. & Turillo, C.J. 1999. Theorizing as the thickness of thin abstraction. *Academy of Management Review*, 24, 4, 742-758.

\*Quinn, R.E. 2000. *Change the world: How ordinary people can accomplish extraordinary results*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. (appendix)

Verhoeven, C. 1972. Wonder and philosophy. *The philosophy of wonder*.

Van de Ven, A.H. 1989. Nothing is quite so practical as a good theory. *Academy of Management Review*, 14, 4, 486-489.

Bacharach, S.B. 1989. Organizational theories: Some criteria for evaluation. *Academy of Management Review*, 14, 4, 496-515.

DiMaggio, P.J. 1995. Comments on what theory is not. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 40, 391-397.

Morris, M.W., Dwok, L., Ames, D., & Lickel, B. 1999. Views from inside and outside: Integrating emic and etic insights about culture and justice judgment. *Academy of Management Review*, 24, 4, 781-796.

Cameron, K.S., Dutton, J.E., & Quinn, R.E. 2003. Foundations of positive organizational scholarship. In K.S. Cameron, J.E. Dutton, & R.E. Quinn (Eds.), *Positive organizational scholarship*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

### **One Last Thing to Think About**

As mentioned above, over the course of the qualitative research methods course, you will conduct your own mini-qualitative research project (participant observation and interviewing → coding and first order analysis/second order analysis → theory building and writing for publication). Now is a good time to start thinking about what project you want to do. For example:

- You may want to use this project as a “pilot test” for your dissertation (i.e., do interviews and participant observation focused on your expected dissertation topic and use them as a way to get more familiar with the topic and try out your interview questions, etc.).
- You may want to do a “project of convenience” in which you study a phenomenon going on right in your place of work so that the participant observation and interviewing is easy to accomplish in the given timeframes.
- You may want to do a project that is completely out in left field. For example, during my sabbatical I was recently in Venice, Italy. I could have done some

participant observation and interviewing about the partying routines of middle-aged Italians during Carnival or about the eating rituals of Italian men and women in Venice!

- You may want to do your project alone, or you may want to do it in a “research team” with other cohort members. Research teams can be very rich in terms of the learning, dialogue and meaning making. A team approach also provides a larger “data base” and the potential for a higher level of “inter-rater reliability” if you want to push toward publication (although “inter-rate reliability” is not always necessary or even desirable in some forms of qualitative research). (If you take the team approach, each person will still be responsible for their own individual work).

So, be thinking about these things and talking about them with your fellow class members so that you can be ready to move forward.