

S-507: Interviewing in Qualitative Research

Professor Sarah Dryden-Peterson¹

Version: 27 January 2015, FINAL

Spring 2015

Professor	Office	Email
Sarah Dryden-Peterson	Gutman 457	sarah_dryden-peterson@gse.harvard.edu

Teaching Fellows	Office	Email
Eleanor O'Donnell		ebo645@mail.harvard.edu
Deepa Vasudevan		dsv066@mail.harvard.edu

Faculty Assistant	Office	Email
Wendy Angus	Gutman 471	wendy_angus@harvard.edu

Course Meeting Information

Wednesday 10am-1pm

Office Hours

Professor Dryden-Peterson:

- Please contact Wendy Angus to schedule an appointment.

Teaching Fellows:

- By appointment. Please email to schedule an appointment.

Course Website

<https://canvas.harvard.edu/courses/1992>

COURSE DESCRIPTION

This course explores qualitative interviewing as a research strategy and as a practice. The focus of the course is on learning the craft of interviewing. This course is apprenticeship-based, designed so that students can situate their own qualitative interviewing experiences in the context of readings and discussions that critically engage theoretical and methodological issues and debates. Students will engage in the mentored practice of interviewing through a research project based at a local community-based organization. Interviewing can be thought of as a conversation in relationship, an inherently interpersonal and social enterprise. Students will build relationships within this organization that span from initiating the research to collecting data to discussing analyses to reporting on findings. We will discuss ethical issues in qualitative research and consider how researcher positionality, identity, and power differentials between the researcher and participants impact on the research process. Students will have the opportunity to develop

¹ With thanks to Michelle Bellino and Irene Liefshitz, the Research Assistants who helped to develop this course; and to the Teaching Fellows who have helped to build and shape this course: 2013: Connie Chung and Paul Kuttner; 2014: Michelle Bellino and Jessica Fei; 2015: Deepa Vasudevan and Eleanor O'Donnell.

their own personal approach to interviewing in the context of a democratic learning community, where we support each other's development as researchers.

The course is limited to 16 students. Priority will be given to HGSE doctoral students. All students are expected to enroll in the course Satisfactory/No Credit.

COURSE FORMAT

This course is designed as an apprenticeship in research using methods of qualitative interviewing. It is structured around a research project with the [Stride](#) program, a leadership development program that engages 40 undergraduates from Harvard College in socially just and meaningful service in communities. It has been run through the [Phillips Brooks House Association](#) (PBHA) for over thirty years. "Stride Scholars," the young people who participate in this program, have three commitments. First, they engage in consistent service work with one of the [PBHA programs](#) during both the school year and summer, often taking on leadership positions within these organizations. The service work includes afterschool tutoring, youth mentoring, in-school reading support, housing advocacy, and more. Second, they meet with peers regularly for group reflection and shared learning about their experiences with service, community leadership, career aspirations, etc. Third, they participate in a one-to-one mentoring program with PBHA staff or community members. Students are *only* eligible to apply to be a Stride Scholar if they receive federal Work-Study and/or significant financial aid, or are from a low-income background. Stride Scholars can access federal Work-Study funds for their service work.

In the spirit of apprenticeship and collective learning, we (as a class) will focus our research inquiry at this one site. Stride provides a context in which multiple issues in education can be explored related to youth development, civic engagement, campus-based experiences of low-income youth, mentoring, community-based organizations, and many more. Together with Stride staff, we will determine the specific research questions that we will examine over the semester. Within the site and the shared research questions, my hope is that students in this course will also see space to explore their own research interests.

During the course, we will work through a research project collaboratively, from beginning to end. This process will include:

- developing relationships and gaining access to a site
- becoming familiar with a site through participant observation
- writing fieldnotes
- defining a research question, in collaboration with program leadership
- selecting participants to interview
- developing interview guides (for multiple types of research participants and different research goals)
- developing rapport with research participants
- conducting interviews (3 over the semester)
- writing Listening Notes
- transcribing interviews
- sharing transcripts with research participants

- writing analytic memos
- analyzing data, including coding with Atlas.ti
- writing up findings
- presenting and discussing findings with research site participants

The process of research is iterative, and we will reflect upon each component of the work in class and through written assignments, and use learning to inform the next stages.

Proficiency in the qualitative analysis software Atlas.ti is a goal of this course, and a useful skill for all educational researchers no matter what kind of research you intend to pursue. One training session will be held in class and other training opportunities will be available through the Information Technologies Center over the course of the semester. If you are already proficient with the software, you do not need to attend additional training sessions, but you are required to attend the class session, and we hope you can act as a resource person as well as benefit from discussions of strategies for collaboration using the software.

Our class time will be most frequently structured as a workshop. We will use discussion of the readings, both methodological and empirical, to push forward our thinking about the design, conduct, and reflection on the research project and our development as researchers. We will work in pairs for some interviews and consistently in small learning communities within the class. Students will have the opportunity to select research partners but need not have pre-selected a partner before beginning the class. Every new research experience involves new learning, and I expect each of us, no matter what our experience with research, to both learn and teach within the class.

COURSE EXPECTATIONS AND ASSIGNMENTS

This course is fast-paced and hands-on, designed to mirror the process of doing research. Most of the readings and assignments for the class involve thinking and action to take the research forward. The more you put into your reading and work on the assignments, the more you will get out of the course. Deadlines have been structured in a very specific way in order to allow for the research project to unfold over the course of the semester. As in any collaborative project, we are all depending on each other to get work done in a timely way. Except in cases of documentable emergencies, no extensions will be granted.

Students are expected to:

- Come to class having done all of the readings carefully and thoroughly;
- Be prepared to contribute to class discussions;
- Engage with other students in respectful, thoughtful, and generous ways in order to foster a democratic classroom and research partnership in which everyone feels comfortable sharing and learning;
- Create respectful and equitable relationships with research participants in both participant observation and interviews;
- Submit all assignments on time (see note above; and please check dates for all assignments when deciding whether this course will work for you this semester);
- Seek out assistance or guidance from the Teaching Team and other students whenever necessary.

Tips on Reading

What to read

All of the Required Readings on the syllabus are critical to the learning in the class. I have noted the number of pages of reading for each week so that you can be well-informed of the reading load to expect. You will also see that the reading load varies from week to week in relation to how much research work is expected.

I suggest that you read in the order on the syllabus. This does not mean that the last reading is less important; in fact, often it is the most important but needs the context of the previous readings to be most illuminating.

How to read

Your reading should be engaged, thorough, and reflective. It is helpful to respond to the following questions:

Questions to ask of methodological readings

- What epistemology is advocated by the author's approach?
- What technical elements do the author(s) emphasize? What is the science of interviewing?
- What relational elements do the author(s) emphasize? What is the craft of interviewing?
- What methodological ideas can you put into practice at this stage of our research project?
- What "good ideas" will you put in your *toolkit* for your own research?

Questions to ask of empirical readings

- What "conversation" (intellectual/political context) does the reading enter into/respond to?
- What methods are used? How do the author(s) describe the rationale, benefits, and challenges of their choices?
- How do the author(s) make ethical decisions? What challenges do they encounter?
- How do the author(s) use interview data in their writing? Do you find it in/effective? In what ways?
- What/whose points of view are presented/represented? What/whose are missing?
- What can you tell about the research relationships from the writing? What do you wish you knew?
- Who is the intended audience?
- What "good ideas" will you put in your *toolkit* for your own research?

Assignments

Assignments in this class are on-going and formative in nature. The more you put into them, the more you will get out. Assignments are listed in the week in which they are due. Please look carefully at the content, instructions, and dates for each assignment. We will of course discuss assignments in class, and often we will dedicate class time to work on various assignments in an environment where we can support each other.

Recording Interviews

If your interview participants consent, you will audio record the interviews with them. HGSE IT has digital audio recorders that you may borrow, and these recorders represent the best sound

quality. Some students in the past have also used their phones to generate recordings, using various Apps including Voice Memos and DropVox, although they have noted that the sound quality is not as reliable, and it can be challenging to rewind with precision when transcribing; some have also used Garageband on their computers, although this requires a laptop to be open, which can be cumbersome for the relationship with an interview participant.

Professor/TF Feedback

You will receive on-going feedback from the Teaching Fellows and myself. This feedback will take numerous forms, appropriate to an apprenticeship model of learning.

- The teaching team will accompany students during the study break with Stride Scholars, creating the opportunity for modeling of participant observation and sharing of perspectives on the experience.
- Students will receive written feedback from one Teaching Fellow on their interview guides in addition to workshopping them during class time.
- We will discuss interviews transcripts and fieldnotes in class, using examples from the class to identify challenging moments, skillful practice, ethical dilemmas, emerging themes, etc.
- Students will receive written feedback from one Teaching Fellow on Listening Notes.
- For one of the first two interviews, students will have an individual conversation with me about their interview guide, transcript, and Listening Notes as a way to reflect on the process and offer suggestions for improved practice.
- We will discuss creation of codes and on-going analysis in class, including doing this analysis work in class when the Teaching Team is available to answer questions and offer feedback in the moment.
- We will debrief and offer feedback to each other on the final presentation to Stride.
- Students will receive feedback from me on their final memo.

Grading

All students are expected to enroll in the course Satisfactory/No Credit. To receive a Satisfactory grade, students must fulfill all requirements of the course as outlined above, in a timely manner.

GENERAL ACADEMIC EXPECTATIONS AND SUPPORT STRUCTURES

Ensure that all of your work is original and, where appropriate, cited. Plagiarism is a serious offence. Students are expected to abide by HGSE policy regarding academic honesty. Please carefully read the section of the [Student Handbook](#) that explains the HGSE policy on plagiarism. If you have any questions, please see a member of the Teaching Team.

REQUIRED TEXTS

Maxwell, Joseph A. (2013). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach* (3rd edition). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Rubin, Henry J. and Irene S. Rubin. (2005). *Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Seidman, I. (2006). *Interviewing as qualitative research* (3rd edition ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.

READINGS

The readings for this course are accessible three different ways—as Required Texts (RT), on the iPa© page, or via Harvard E-Resources. The syllabus indicates where to locate each reading. For the readings available in Harvard E-Resources, we have embedded persistent links (all you need to do is click on the word E-Resources) that should take you directly to the articles via HUID and PIN log-in. If a link does not work, which is always a possibility, then you will need to use [HOLLIS+](#) to locate the reading yourself.

OVERVIEW OF SYLLABUS

Week	Topic	Site-Based Work	
		Out-of-class (to do before the class in which the activity is listed)	In-class
1 Jan 28	Research Design and Choice of Methods: Why Interviewing?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Post on class Blog research puzzles of interest 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learn about Stride • Identify research puzzles relevant to Stride
2 Feb 4	Gaining Access, Developing Relationships, Defining a Research Question, Fieldnotes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of one article for annotated bibliography 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meet Stride Directors and decide on a research question
3 Feb 11	Developing the Interview Guide	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encounter with Stride Scholars at study break (Monday Feb. 9, 8-9pm, PBHA, TBC) and write fieldnotes • Read others' fieldnotes (n=15) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Debrief and reflection on encounter and conversations • Begin to prepare Interview #1 guide
4 Feb 18	Developing the Interview Guide continued; Research Relationships; Listening to Data and Probing; Listening Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prepare Interview #1 guide and schedule Interview #1 (in pairs) • Read others' Interview #1 guides (n=7) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Workshop Interview #1 guide
5 Feb 25	On-Going Analysis; Power Dynamics in Interviewing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct Interview #1 (in pairs) • Write Listening Notes • Read others' Listening Notes (n=15) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Debrief and reflection on Interview #1 • Process of collaborating on research
6 March 4	Emerging Analysis; Deepening Data Collection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transcribe Interview #1 and send to interviewee (in pairs) • Prepare Interview #2 guide and schedule Interview #2 (in pairs) • Read others' transcripts (n=7) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emerging analysis of Interview #1 • Workshop Interview #2 guide
7 March 11	Qualitative Data Analysis Software	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct Interview #2 (in pairs) • Write Listening Notes • Conduct site visit and follow-up conversation (anytime after first interview and before spring break) • Schedule Interview #3 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Atlas.ti training
8 March 25	Analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transcribe Interview #2 and send to interviewee (in pairs) • Read others' Listening Notes (n=15) and transcripts (n=7) • Prepare Interview #3 guide 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Begin formal analysis of Transcript #1 • Develop a shared code list
9 April 1	Coding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct Interview #3 (individual) • Write Listening Notes • Read others' Listening Notes (n=15) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Begin coding transcripts of Interview #1 and #2 and Listening Notes of Interview #3

<i>Week</i>	<i>Topic</i>	<i>Site-Based Work</i>	
		<i>Out-of-class (to do before the class in which the activity is listed)</i>	<i>In-class</i>
10 April 8	Analysis continued; Validity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete coding of Interview #1 and #2 (in pairs) and Listening Notes from Interview #3 (individual) • Read others' coded transcripts (n=14) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discuss emerging "story" from the data • Identify thematic areas of findings
11 April 15	Writing Up Findings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prepare section of analysis 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Begin to develop presentation for Stride
12 April 22	Presenting Findings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft your section of the presentation (in groups) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Practice presentations for Stride
13 May 1, 11am- 1pm (FRIDAY, TBC)	Discussion of Findings with Stride	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Practice presentations for Stride 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion of findings with Stride

SYLLABUS

1. January 28 Research Design and Choice of Methods: Why Interviewing?

Many, if not most, social science investigations use interviewing as a source of data. This week we will discuss: Why might you choose to use interviews in your research? What does qualitative interviewing data look like? What kind of knowledge can/does it generate? What is the difference between a Methodology and a method? What is the experience of participating in an interview (as interviewer and interviewee)? This week we will also become familiar with the [Stride program](#) of Harvard College's Phillips Brooks House and discuss this program as a field site for the research we will do in this course. As we build our knowledge about this research site, we will begin the process of defining research questions within the context of research design, conceptual frameworks, and researcher identity. What do we want to know/understand? What is the "puzzle"? What can be accomplished in this study (and what cannot be accomplished in this study)? What is the purpose of this knowledge (for you, for the world)? What makes a question interesting (to you, to the world), useful (to you, to the world), researchable? What do you bring to this research from your experiences, identity, politics? How does design impact validity? While we will be discussing the process of defining a research question, we decide on the question(s) through dialogue with the Stride team in class #2.

Required Readings (total pages 84; plus audio recordings, Stride memos, and website exploration)

- Weiss, R. S. (1994). *Learning from strangers: the art and method of qualitative interview studies*. New York: Free Press, 1-14. (iPa©)
- Seidman, I. (2006). *Interviewing as qualitative research* (3rd edition ed.). New York: Teachers College Press, 7-14. (RT)
- Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research*. London: Sage, 105-117. (iPa©)
- Lamont, Michèle, & Swidler, Ann. (2014). Methodological Pluralism and the Possibilities and Limits of Interviewing. *Qualitative Sociology*. (19 pages) ([E-Resources](#))
- Jackson, M. (2007). Migrant Imaginaries. *Excursions*. Durham: Duke University Press, 102-134. (iPa©)
- Terkel, Studs. [Interview with Betty Rundle](#) (16 minutes, 46 seconds) from interviews for *Race: how Blacks and whites think and feel about the American obsession*; [Interview with George Drossos](#) (7 minutes, 43 seconds) from interviews for *Division Street: America*.
- Read about Stride on the organization [website](#).
- Please explore the [Q website](#), which we will draw on for class discussion.

Further Reading (if you have not already done these readings for another class, please make time for them)

- Maxwell, J. A. (2013). A Model for Qualitative Research Design. *Qualitative research design: an interactive approach* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage, 1-21.
- Maxwell, J. A. (2013). Conceptual Framework: What do you think is going on? *Qualitative research design: an interactive approach* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, Calif.:

Sage, 39-72. (RT)

- Maxwell, J. A. (2013). Research Questions: What do you want to understand? *Qualitative research design: an interactive approach* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage, 73-86. (RT)
- Rubin, H. J., & Rubin, I. S. (2005). Design: Choosing Topics and Anticipating Data Analysis. *Qualitative Interviewing: The Art of Hearing Data* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 47-48, 52-62. (RT)

Assignments

- Post on the class Blog some of the puzzles that you would like to discuss related to Stride. Your thoughts will help us to think about possible research questions related to our Stride field site (approximate length one double-spaced page). Due Tuesday January 27 at 9am.
- If you have not already done so, complete the [Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative](#) (CITI) training on-line. For the elective modules, please be sure to complete the ones on Research with Children and Research in Public Elementary and Secondary Schools. Submit your report form/certificate of course completion to the course dropbox. Many of you will have already completed this training in connection with another course or research project; in that case, please submit your report/certificate.

2. February 4 **Gaining Access, Developing Relationships, Defining a Research Question** (Note: our class will meet this week in the [Parlor Room at PBHA](#). Meet in front of Gutman Library at 9:50am if you would like to walk there as a group.)

This week we will discuss the process of “gaining access” to a field site and to research participants, with a focus on the on-going building of relationships. How do you identify a field site? How do you make contact? How do you approach people to be interviewed and what makes it more likely that they will agree? How do you develop a relationship? What is the role of participant observation? What does a research relationship look like? What are the expectations on both sides? What are your ethical responsibilities to your research participants? How do researchers make decisions about ethical dilemmas? What does it mean to do research in partnership with a community organization? We will also discuss the initial encounter with Stride participants and techniques of making fieldnotes. We will meet with Stride Directors during class time and engage in collaborative discussion on the development of a research question.

Required Readings (total pages 95 + short blog)

- Luttrell, W. (2010). Interactive and Reflexive Models of Qualitative Research Design. In W. Luttrell (Ed.), *Qualitative educational research: readings in reflexive methodology and transformative practice*. New York, NY: Routledge, 159-163. (iPa©)
- Seidman, I. (2006). *Interviewing as qualitative research* (3rd edition). New York: Teachers College Press, 40-56. (RT)
- Behar, R. (1996). *The vulnerable observer: anthropology that breaks your heart*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1-33. (iPa©)
- Smith, L. T. (1999). *Decolonizing methodologies: research and indigenous peoples*. London: Zed Books, 196-199. (iPa©)

- Stanton-Salazar, R. D. (2001). *Manufacturing Hope and Despair: The School and Kin Networks of U.S.-Mexican Youth*. New York: Teachers College Press, ix-xi. (iPa©)
- MacLeod, J. (1995). Appendix: On the making of Ain't no makin' it. *Ain't no makin' it: aspirations and attainment in a low-income neighborhood*. Boulder: Westview Press, 270-302. (iPa©)
- Succarie, Mayssun. (2014). [Bartering Palestine for Research](#).

Further Reading

- Anyon, J. (2006). What Should Count as Educational Research: Notes Toward a New Paradigm. In G. Ladson-Billings & W. F. Tate (Eds.), *Education research in the public interest: social justice, action, and policy*. New York: Teachers College Press, 17-26.
- Wolfinger, N.H. (2002). On writing fieldnotes: Collection strategies and background expectancies. *Qualitative Research* 2(1): 85-95. ([E-Resources](#))
- Emerson, Robert, Rachel Fretz, and Linda Shaw. (1995). Processing Fieldnotes: Coding and Memoing. *Writing Ethnographic Fieldnotes*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1-65.
- Mishler, Eliot. (1991). *Research Interviewing: Context and Narrative*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 117-135.
- Tuck, E. (2009). Suspending Damage: A Letter to Communities. *Harvard Educational Review*, 79(3), 409-428.

Assignment

- Review one of the empirical articles from the Stride Preliminary Bibliography (at the end of the syllabus). Prepare a summary of the article in the structure of the example provided. Due Tuesday February 3 at 9am.

3. February 11 Developing the Interview Guide

This week we will begin the process of developing the interview guide for the first interview, which will be with one of the Junior Counselors who participates in the Stride Program. We will discuss the thinking behind an interview guide. What kind of data do we need to answer our research question? What kinds of questions can elicit what kind of data? How do interview questions differ from research questions? What makes an effective interview question? How can the questions you ask facilitate the relationship? How can placement of interview questions influence the flow and content of the interview? How closely do researchers follow an interview guide? When are researchers flexible, following the narrative of the interview? We will also build on what we have learned about Stride, through the meeting with the Directors and the study break with Stride Scholars. What questions did the study break raise? What questions are asked in fieldnotes that could be further explored in an interview? What do we know from our collaborative literature review about the experiences of low-income students on elite campuses and young people's participation in programs like Stride?

Required Readings (total pages 100, plus short newspaper article)

- Rubin, Henry J. and Irene S. Rubin. (2005). *Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage, 108-200. (RT)
- Weiss, Robert S. (1994). *Learning from strangers: The art and method of qualitative interview studies*. New York: The Free Press, pp. 45-51; 74-76. (iPa©)

- Kvale, S., & Brinkmann, S. (2009). *InterViews: learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing* (2nd ed.). Los Angeles: Sage Publications, 130-138; 171-173. (iPa©)
- Pérez-Peña, Richard. (2014, 25 August). [Generation Later, Poor Are Still Rare at Elite Colleges](#), *New York Times*.

Further Reading

- McAdam, D. (1988). *Freedom Summer*. New York: Oxford University Press, 161-198.
- Seider, S. (2010). *Shelter: where Harvard meets the homeless*. New York: Continuum, 165-194.

Assignment

- You will become familiar with the Stride program through participation in a study break get together with the Stride Scholars. This study break will take place on Monday February 9 from 8-9pm in the Parlor Room at PBHA (TBC). You will write up your thoughts on the encounters and conversations later that evening or the next morning, while they are fresh in your mind. Please submit these fieldnotes to the course iSite. Due by Tuesday February 10 at 5pm.
- Read over the fieldnotes posted by your classmates. Come prepared to discuss emerging themes related to our research questions as well as differences in observations across different conversations and across different researchers. Due Wednesday February 11, in class (please note that this is very little time to review them given the timing of the study break and our class, so plan ahead).

4. February 18 Developing the Interview Guide continued; Research Relationships; Listening to Data and Probing; Fieldnotes and Listening Notes

This week we will workshop the annotated interview guides for the first interview with a Stride Scholar, which you have prepared (see Assignment, below). We will return to the discussion questions from week #3 as tools to examine the interview guides and provide feedback for revision. By the end of class, you will have a finalized interview guide for use in the first interview. We will further explore the development of interviewing relationships and related ethical issues. What is your interview style? What role does tone play in an interview interaction? What kinds of questions are appropriate/ethical in a research setting? How do you make decisions “on the fly”? We will also discuss the tenet of “do no harm” and the protection of research participants. How does harm happen? How can it be avoided? What are the responsibilities of a researcher? In class, we will review a standard consent form and tailor it for this research project. This week we will also examine the experience of the interview itself. What does it mean to listen to data? How do you ask follow-up questions and probe for more and/or different information? What is the role of interview fieldnotes? What are the differences between fieldnotes, Listening Notes, and memos? What role does each play as data and/or analysis? We will examine examples of each in class.

Required Readings (total pages 92)

- McPhee, John. (2014, 7 April 2014). [Elicitation](#). *The New Yorker*. (7 pages)
- Rubin, Henry J. and Irene S. Rubin. (2005). *Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage, 79-104. (RT)
- Kvale, S., & Brinkmann, S. (2009). *InterViews: learning the craft of qualitative research*

interviewing (2nd ed.). Los Angeles: Sage Publications, 128-130. (iPa©)

- Gaztambide-Fernández, R. A., Cairns, K., Kawashima, Y., Menna, L., & VanderDussen, E. (2011). Portraiture as Pedagogy: Learning Research through the Exploration of Context and Methodology. *International Journal of Education & the Arts*, 12(4), 1-29. ([E-Resources](#))
- Lawrence-Lightfoot, S., & Davis, J. H. (1997). *The Art and Science of Portraiture*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 135-159. (iPa©)
- Kvale, S., & Brinkmann, S. (2009). *InterViews: learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing* (2nd ed.). Los Angeles: Sage Publications, 138-40. (iPa©)

Recommended Readings

- Dryden-Peterson, S. (2010). Bridging Home: Building Relationships Between Immigrant and Long-Time Resident Youth. *Teachers College Record*, 112(9), 2320–2351.
- Seidman, I. (2006). *Interviewing as qualitative research* (3rd edition). New York: Teachers College Press, 96-111.
- Waters, M. C. (2001). Appendix: Notes on methodology. *Black Identities: West Indian Immigrant Dreams and American Realities*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 347-371.
- Seidman, I. (2006). *Interviewing as qualitative research* (3rd edition ed.). New York: Teachers College Press, pp. 78-92. (For many, this chapter will be review.)
- Welty, E. (2003). *One Writer's Beginning*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 3-39.

Assignment

- With your interview partner, prepare a draft interview guide for the first interview, with a Stride Scholar. Annotate your interview guide using the comment function on Microsoft Word, to provide commentary on what kind of data you are hoping to elicit from each question, your thinking on the order of the questions, and your choice of phrasing for each question. Please post your interview guide on the course iSite. You will receive written feedback on the interview guide from the Teaching Team before class #4. Due Tuesday February 17 at 9am.
- Read over the interview guides prepared by your classmates to prepare for discussion in class of the guides and revisions to them (we will not come up with one standard interview guide but research partnerships may decide to use some of the same questions as classmates). Due Wednesday February 18, in class.
- With the logistical assistance of the Teaching Team, you will also initiate contact and schedule the first interview.

5. February 25 On-Going Analysis; Power Dynamics in Interviewing

This week we will discuss the process of doing the first interview (see Assignment, below). What went well? What could have gone better? What were the surprises? In your small learning community, you will debrief the process and review your individual fieldnotes and Listening Notes. What were the similarities in your perceptions and interpretations of the interviews? What were the differences? What did you notice when you listened to the interview? What questions elicited particularly interesting/useful data? What questions did not? What do you wish you had asked? What themes are emerging from across the interviews? What are strategies for respectful and authentic interactions across power differences? What do you do when your questions do not

resonate with your research participant? How do you establish comfort for research participants for whom an interview situation is unfamiliar and uncomfortable? We will address how conceptual frameworks and cultural assumptions shape the approach to understanding data and how researchers combine interview data with other data. We will also discuss the process of collaborative research. What does it mean to share your research work? How does it feel? As we prepare to transcribe the first interview, we will discuss the process of transcription.

Required Readings (total pages 4; focus on data collection this week)

- Green, J., Franquiz, M., & Dixon, C. (1997). The Myth of the Objective Transcript: Transcribing as a Situated Act. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31(1), 172-176. ([E-Resources](#))

Further Reading

- Briggs, C. L. (1986). Interview techniques vis-à-vis native metacommunicative repertoires; or, on the analysis of communicative blunders. *Learning how to ask: a sociolinguistic appraisal of the role of the interview in social science research*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 39-60.
- Dryden-Peterson, S. (2011). Reconciliation through relationships among teachers and sub-Saharan African families in the U.S.A. In J. Paulson (Ed.), *Education and Reconciliation: Exploring Conflict and Post-Conflict Situations*. London: Continuum, 32-54.

Assignment

- With your interview partner, conduct the first interview. The interview should be conducted between Wednesday February 18 and Monday February 23 in order for you to have enough time to prepare for class. You should schedule one hour for the interview, with the goal of the interview itself being 30 to 40 minutes in length. During the interview, one partner should be primarily concerned with the interview conversation and the other with taking fieldnotes on the interview (these roles will switch for the second interview). After the interview, create Listening Notes: listen to the interview and make notes on what you hear, preliminary themes you identify, quotations of interest, and a section of your reflections on the effectiveness of the interview (what questions elicited particularly interesting/useful data, what questions did not, what do you wish you had asked?) Post your Listening Notes to the via Canvas, Due Tuesday February 24 at 9am.
- Read the Listening Notes prepared by your classmates (you will want to plan ahead for this as there is only one day between when the Listening Notes will be posted and the class session). Come to class prepared to discuss emerging themes. Due Wednesday February 25, in class.

6. March 4 Emerging Analysis; Deepening Data Collection

This week we will look closely at the transcripts from the first interviews and identify themes that are emerging across the data. What evidence supports these emerging themes? What confusions and contradictions are present? How might we deepen our data collection around some of these themes? We will also examine the draft interview guides for the second interview, with a second Stride Scholar. Based on the data we have from the first interview, what data is missing that might be sought in the second interview? By the end of class, you will have a finalized interview guide for use in the second interview.

Required Readings

- No readings this week. Focus on research work (listed below in Assignments).

Assignment

- Transcribe the first interview. Each interview partner will transcribe half of the interview to make the work manageable (it is usually fair to estimate four times the recording time as the time it will take to transcribe). Post the transcript via Canvas; bring a printed copy to class; and send the transcript to the person you interviewed, inviting any commentary or correction. Due Tuesday March 3 at 9am.
- Working with your interview partner, develop the interview guide for the second interview, with a second Stride Scholar. You will want to reflect on the transcript from your first interview in thinking about the content, phrasing, and order of your interview questions. Post the interview guide via Canvas (you will have time in class to review the interview guides developed by your classmates). Due Wednesday March 4, in class.
- Read the interview transcripts posted by your classmates (7 other interviews). Come to class ready to discuss themes you see emerging across the data (you will have from Wednesday at 9am when the transcripts are posted until class on Thursday to review them). Due Wednesday March 4, in class.
- With the assistance of the Teaching Team, you will initiate contact with the research participant and schedule the second interview.

7. March 11 Qualitative Data Analysis Software: Atlas.ti Training (Note: Class will meet in Gutman 302 computer lab)

Bill Johnston of the Learning Technologies Center will guide you through an Atlas.ti training session designed to familiarize you with the program and get you ready for the analysis you will do for this class.

Required Readings

- No readings this week. Focus on research work (listed below in Assignments).

Assignment

- With your interview partner, conduct the second interview. The interview should be conducted between Wednesday March 4 and Monday March 9 so that you can complete your Listening Notes before spring break. (You are welcome to complete the transcript over spring break, if your schedule allows, but it is not due until the Tuesday after spring break). You should schedule one hour for the interview, with the goal of the interview itself being 30 to 40 minutes in length. During the interview, one partner should be primarily concerned with the interview conversation and the other with taking fieldnotes on the interview (these roles should be the opposite from the first interview). After the interview, create Listening Notes: listen to the interview and make notes on what you hear, preliminary themes you identify, quotations of interest, and a section of your reflections on the effectiveness of the interview (what questions elicited particularly interesting/useful data, what questions did not, what do you wish you had asked?) Post your Listening Notes via Canvas, , Due Tuesday March 10 at 9am. You will receive written feedback on your Listening Notes from the Teaching Team.

- Conduct a site visit to the service placement of Stride Scholar you interviewed in the first interview. This site visit can take place any time after your first interview and before spring break. You will arrange this visit with the Stride Scholar you interviewed. See if you can arrange the visit so that you will have a short amount of time to talk with your interview participant afterwards perhaps on a ride back to Cambridge, over coffee, or at the site itself. You can use this opportunity to follow-up, for example, on lingering questions from your first interview, on what you observed in the placement site, on themes of on-going analysis from across the transcripts of our team. You will take fieldnotes during your visit and after the conversation, and complete them later that same day/evening. Please submit your fieldnotes via Canvas. Due by Friday March 13 at noon.
- With the assistance of the Teaching Team, you will initiate contact with the research participant and schedule the third interview.

March 18 Spring Break

8. March 25 Analysis

This week we will explore the process of formal analysis of interview data. What is the relationship between text/transcript and analysis? How do you develop etic and emic codes? What do you do with codes? What is the relationship between codes, code families, and findings? We will engage in code development in class. How do you define codes? How are codes merged? How do you refine codes across multiple transcripts? We come up with a preliminary code list of etic and emic codes. We will also discuss organization and management of data.

Required Readings (total pages 56 + 30 pages of comic book)

- Rubin, Henry J. and Irene S. Rubin. (2005). *Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage, 201-223. (RT)
- Seidman, I. (2006). *Interviewing as qualitative research* (3rd edition ed.). New York: Teachers College Press, pp. 112-118, 125-131. (RT)
- Fine, Michelle, & Sirin, Selcuk R. (2007). Theorizing Hyphenated Selves: Researching Youth Development in and across Contentious Political Contexts. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 1(1), 16-38. ([E-Resources](#))
- Galman, Sally Campbell. *The good, the bad, and the data: Shane the Lone ethnographer's basic guide to qualitative data analysis*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press, pp. 16-46. (p.20-29 are in the iPa©, please read the rest of the selection on reserve)

Further Reading

- Emerson, Robert, Rachel Fretz, and Linda Shaw. (1995). Processing Fieldnotes: Coding and Memoing. *Writing Ethnographic Fieldnotes*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 142-168.
- Glesne, Corinne. (2006). Finding Your Story: Data Analysis. *Becoming Qualitative Researchers: An Introduction* (3rd edition). NY: Longman, 147-171.
- Huberman, A. M., & Miles, M. B. (2003). Data Management and Analysis Methods. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Collecting and interpreting qualitative materials* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage., 179-210.
- Weiss, Robert S. (1994). *Learning from strangers: The art and method of qualitative*

interview studies. New York: The Free Press, pp. 151-182.

Assignment

- Transcribe the second interview. Each interview partner will transcribe half of the interview to make the work manageable (again, it is usually fair to estimate four times the recording time as the time it will take to transcribe). Post the transcript via Canvas; bring a printed copy to class; and send the transcript to the person you interviewed, inviting any commentary or correction. Due Tuesday March 24 at 9am.
- Read the Listening Notes from the second interview prepared by your classmates. Come to class prepared to discuss emerging themes. Due Wednesday March 25, in class.
- Read the interview transcripts from the second interview posted by your classmates (7 other interviews). Come to class ready to discuss themes you see emerging across the data. Due Wednesday March 25, in class.
- Develop the interview guide for the third interview and share it with your interview partner for feedback. If you have questions you would like to discuss with the Teaching Team about the guide, please send it for feedback by Monday March 23 at 9am (only after getting feedback from your interview partner). Post the final version via Canvas. Due Tuesday March 24 at 5pm.

9. April 1 Coding (Note: Class will meet in Gutman 302 computer lab)

This class session will be a workshop. We will work together in the computer lab and, with your interview partner, you will code transcripts of the first and second interview using Atlas.ti (see Assignments, below). We will arrive at a finalized code list by the end of this workshop.

Required Readings

- No readings this week. Focus on research work (listed below)

Assignment

- Conduct the third interview with an alumni of the Stride Program. You will do this interview individually, not with your partner. The interview should be conducted between Wednesday March 25 and Monday March 30 in order for you to have enough time to prepare for class. You should schedule one hour for the interview, with the goal of the interview itself being 30 to 40 minutes in length. You will both conduct the interview and take fieldnotes. After the interview, make Listening Notes: listen to the interview and make notes on what you hear, preliminary themes you identify, quotations of interest, and a section of your reflections on the effectiveness of the interview (what questions elicited particularly interesting/useful data, what questions did not, what do you wish you had asked?) (Please note that we will *not* transcribe the third interviews, except in a case where a student decides he/she would like to add this additional data to our dataset in preparation for presenting our findings to Stride.) Post your Listening Notes via Canvas, Due Tuesday March 31 at 9am.
- Read the Listening Notes posted by your classmates and come to class prepared to discuss how these additional interviews contribute to the emerging “story” or not. Due Wednesday April 1, in class.

10. April 8 Analysis continued; Validity

This week we will consider various analytic decisions researchers make. What are the differences between issue-based and case-based approaches to analysis? How do I keep track of all of my thinking? What is the “story” that is emerging from our data? What evidence supports our emerging analysis? What evidence points elsewhere? What do you do when the analysis is “messy,” when the “story” is not clear? How do you discuss different interpretations of data with research participants? What do you do when you disagree? We will also discuss issues of validity. In class, we will identify thematic areas of findings to shape into a presentation of findings for the Stride program.

Required Readings (total pages 54)

- Rubin, Henry J. and Irene S. Rubin. (2005). *Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage, 224-245. (RT)
- Warren, M. R. (2010). *Fire in the heart: how white activists embrace racial justice*. New York: Oxford University Press, 149-182. (iPa©)

Further Reading

- Anfara Jr., V. A., Brown, K. M., & Mangione, T. L. (2002). Qualitative Analysis on Stage: Making the Research Process More Public. *Educational Researcher* (October), 28-38.
- Borland, K. (1991). "That's Not What I Said": Interpretive Conflict in Oral Narrative Research. In S. B. Gluck & D. Patai (Eds.), *Women's words: the feminist practice of oral history*. New York: Routledge, 63-75.
- Lico, S., & Luttrell, W. (2011). An Important Part of Me: A Dialogue About Difference. *Harvard Educational Review*, 81(4), 667-686.
- Maxwell, J. A. (2013). Validity: How Might You Be Wrong? *Qualitative research design: an interactive approach* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage, 121-138. (For many, this may be review.)

Assignment

- With your interview partner, complete the coding of transcripts from the first and second interviews and the Listening Notes from the third interview. Store coded transcripts on the class section of the X-drive. Due Monday April 6, 9am.
- Read all of the coded transcripts stored on the X-drive and come to class prepared to discuss “the story” that you see emerging from the data (you will want to plan ahead for this as there are only two days between when the coded transcripts will be available and the class session). Due Wednesday April 8, in class.

11. April 15 Writing Up Findings

This week we will discuss the process of conveying findings to a particular audience. How do researchers make use of interview data in scholarly writing? How do researchers make use of interview data when writing for the public? What ethical issues arise in presenting data in written form?

Required Readings (total pages 48)

- Rubin, Henry J. and Irene S. Rubin. (2005). *Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing*

- data (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage, 246-273. (RT)
- Fine, M., & Weis, L. (2010). Writing the ‘wrongs’ of fieldwork: Confronting our own research/ writing dilemmas in urban ethnographies In W. Luttrell (Ed.), *Qualitative educational research: readings in reflexive methodology and transformative practice*. New York, NY: Routledge, 448-466. (iPa©)
 - Venkatesh, S. (2008). Reply to Critics. *Qualitative Sociology*, 31(2), 199-202. ([E-Resources](#))

Further Reading

- Venkatesh, S. (1994). Getting Ahead: Social Mobility among the Urban Poor. *Sociological Perspectives*, 37(2), 157-182. ([E-Resources](#))
- Terkel, S. (1993). *Race: how Blacks and whites think and feel about the American obsession* (1st Anchor Books ed.). New York: Anchor Books.
- Lawrence-Lightfoot, S. (2003). *The essential conversation: what parents and teachers can learn from each other* (1st ed.). New York: Random House.

Assignment

- With your group, prepare your section of the analysis, which may involve additional coding, merging of codes, and thematic analysis across codes. Come to class prepared to share your preliminary findings with the class. Due Wednesday April 15, in class.

12. April 22 Presenting Findings

This week we will discuss the process of sharing findings. How do researchers discuss findings with the communities/individuals who have participated in the research? What does this discussion look like? Who participates and how? What continued data collection and analysis goes on at this stage of the research process? What does the process of exiting from research relationships look like? In class, we will practice our presentations for the meeting with Stride on April 30 and provide feedback on how to strengthen the work.

Required Readings (total pages 35)

- Delgado-Gaitan, C. (1993). Researching Change and Changing the Researcher. *Harvard Educational Review*, 63(4), 389-411. ([E-Resources](#))
- Lawrence-Lightfoot, S. (2012). Voices in conversation. *Exit: The endings that set us free*. Farrar, Straus & Giroux, 73-89. (iPa©)

Assignment

- With your group, prepare your section of the presentation for the meeting with Stride on May 1. Please post any slides or other audio/visual materials via Canvas by Wednesday April 22, 9am (knowing that they will be revised on feedback before the final presentation on May 1).

13. May 1 Discussion of Findings with Stride (FRIDAY, TBC)

We will present findings from the research to the Stride Team, including Stride Scholars, Phillips Brooks House staff, and other interested community members. What are reactions to the

findings? What are alternative interpretations of the data and analysis? In what ways might the findings inform participants' thinking, program design, and reflection? In what ways has the research process informed your growth as a researcher? What are next steps (if any)?

Assignment

- With your group, practice your section of the presentation for the meeting with Stride on May 1.

Final Assignment

- Reflection paper on the process of engaging in research and developing as a researcher. What did you learn about yourself as a researcher? What is your interviewing style? How did you develop relationships with research participants? What are your goals in engaging in interviewing for qualitative research? What learning from this course will you put in your "researcher toolkit" for use in future projects? (No more than 750 words)
Due Monday May 11, 12 noon.

Stride Preliminary Bibliography

Aries, E., & Seider, M. (2005). The interactive relationship between class identity and the college experience: The case of lower income students. *Qualitative Sociology*, 28(4), 419-443.

Armstrong, E., & Hamilton, L. T. (2013). *Paying for the party: How college maintains inequality*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Cobham, B. A., & Parker, T. L. (2007). Resituating race into the movement toward multiculturalism and social justice. *New Directions for Student Services*, (120), 85-93.

Espino, M. M. (2012). Seeking the “Truth” in the stories we tell: The role of critical race epistemology in higher education research. *The Review of Higher Education*, 36(1), 31-67.

Espino, M. M., & Lee, J. J. (2011). Understanding resistance: Reflections on race and privilege through service-learning. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 44(2), 136-152.

Green, A.E. (2003). Difficult stories: Service-learning, race, class, and whiteness. *College Composition and Communication*, 55(2), 276-301.

Jones, S. R., & Abes, E. S. (2004). Enduring influences of service-learning on college students' identity development. *Journal of College Student Development*, 45(2), 149-166.

Keen, C. H., & Hall, K. (2008). Engaging with difference matters: Longitudinal student outcomes of co-curricular service-learning programs. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 80(1), 59-79.

Mitchell, T. D. & Donahue, D. M. (2009). “I do more service in this class than I ever do at my site”: Paying attention to the reflections of students of color in service-learning. In J. Strait & M. Lima (Eds.). *The future of service-learning: New solutions for sustaining and improving practice* (pp. 172-190). Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.

Mitchell, T. D., Donahue, D. M., & Young-Law, C. (2012). Service learning as a pedagogy of whiteness. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 45(4), 612-629.

Seider, S., Huguley, J. P., & Novick, S. (2013). College students, diversity, and community service learning. *Teachers College Record*, 115(3), 1-44.

Stuber, J. M. (2006). Talk of class: The discursive repertoires of white working- and upper-middle-class college students. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 35(3), 285-318.