

BRANDEIS UNIVERSITY
Heller School for Social Policy and Management

HS403b – QUALITATIVE RESEARCH – DRAFT

Fall 2018; Wednesdays 2-5PM

Instructor: Nina Kammerer

Office: Heller-Brown 353; Mailbox: Heller-Brown Building (Third Floor)

Office Phone: 6-2940; Email: kammerer@brandeis.edu

Office Hours: Wednesdays 5-6PM and by appointment

>I EXPECT YOU TO READ THIS SYLLABUS<

Course Description (from the Bulletin): *Open to PhD students only.* Acquaints students with the theory and practice of qualitative research. Readings and discussions focus on epistemological and theoretical foundations of qualitative research, how to conduct qualitative research, and its relevance for social policy. Provides students with experience in direct observation, participant observation, and interviewing, as well as in writing field notes, memoing, and transcribing. Qualitative research from study design to analysis and presentation is approached as an iterative and interconnected process. Ethical issues are addressed, with emphasis on requirements for institutional review board applications for projects involving qualitative research methods. Students planning to go on to HS 411b typically prepare an IRB application for a project of their own design. **Note:** *The final sentence is no longer true, as a short essay/memo has replaced the final paper assigned in past years.*

Additional Description: We examine qualitative research as a process in which various stages overlap and inform one another from research design to data collection, analysis, and presentation. A key focus is the interdependence of epistemology, theory, method, and research aims. Research ethics are of central concern and are therefore discussed throughout the semester. We examine differences and similarities in approach and applicability between qualitative and quantitative research methods, as well as their overlap and complementarity.

In keeping with The Heller School's interdisciplinary nature, readings are from a variety of disciplines, including anthropology, education, law, nursing, public health, social policy, social work, and sociology. Readings are a mix of works on methods, including philosophical underpinnings and practical guidance (the why and the how to), and examples of substantive work based on qualitative research and analytical approaches (the what), including explorations of policy-relevant issues in the United States and abroad.

Our work includes critical reading and discussion of readings, hands-on practice of various qualitative research methods, and individual and collaborative reflection on these exercises. Approaches discussed include framework analysis, ethnography, auto-ethnography, institutional ethnography, grounded theory, participatory action research, and mixed methods. Topics considered include ethical obligations and dilemmas, research design, the politics of research, as well as taking field notes, transcribing, interpreting qualitative data, and presenting findings.

The course is a seminar, which means that active participation by everyone is needed. The optimum interaction is a conversation among the group rather than a conversation that is structured like spokes in a wheel, with the instructor the center. Ask questions of yourselves and of one another, not just of me. Challenge yourselves, one another, and me. It is important for all of us to be aware of differences in interactional styles. Some people are comfortable talking in a group; others are not. Those who are comfortable are invited to be mindful of leaving space, indeed making it, for those who are not. Those who are not are invited to contribute to the discussion, not only to practice speaking in a group, but also to share questions and views. We all learn more when we join together to articulate, interrogate, explore, challenge, and support our understandings.

Given that the classroom time is limited and we have lots to cover, I invite all of us to consider when a conversation is best continued in class and when it might be moved elsewhere. Possible places to continue a

conversation are the LATTE discussion board, a one-on-one conversation with me if an issue is central to one student but not others or, for topics of broad interest, a conversation outside class, for example, over coffee.

Academic Integrity: In accordance with Section 4 of the University's *Rights and Responsibilities* student code, "Every member of the University community is expected to maintain the highest standards of academic integrity. A student shall not submit work that is falsified or is not the result of the student's own effort. Infringement of academic honesty by a student subjects that student to serious penalties, which may include failure on the assignment, failure in the course, suspension from the University, or other sanctions (see section 20.). A student who is in doubt regarding standards of academic honesty as they apply to a specific course or assignment should consult the faculty member responsible for that course or assignment before submitting the work. Students may not drop or withdraw from a course while an allegation of academic dishonesty is pending. Instructors may require students to submit work to turnitin.com (plagiarism detection software)" (p. 19). (See <https://www.brandeis.edu/studentlife/srcs/rightsresponsibilities/2016-17%20RR%20.pdf> to access a pdf of the *Rights and Responsibilities* student code.) If you have any questions about the instructions for any assignments in this course, ask me.

Accommodation: If you are a student with a documented disability on record at Brandeis University and wish to have reasonable accommodation made for you in this course, please see me as soon as possible.

Readings: On this syllabus, assigned readings are listed under the date on which they will be discussed. Assigned books are available for purchase at the Brandeis Bookstore; assigned articles or book chapters are available electronically on LATTE.

Textbooks: The following books, listed in the order in which they are assigned, are required reading.

1. Weiss, Robert S., *Learning from Strangers: The Art and Method of Qualitative Interview Studies* (New York, NY: The Free Press, 1994).
2. Charmaz, Kathy, *Constructing Grounded Theory: A Practical Guide through Qualitative Analysis*. 2nd Edition (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Ltd., 2014).
3. Ostrach, Bayla, *Health Policy in a Time of Crisis: Abortion, Austerity, and Access*. *Advances in Medical Anthropology* (New York, NY: Routledge, 2017).

Requirements: You are expected to read assigned materials thoroughly and thoughtfully in advance of the class in which they will be discussed. Evidence of critical reading, relevant comparison across readings, and cumulative learning from readings and discussions should be apparent in class participation and written work.

Four assessed/graded elements, described below, are each worth a percentage of the final course assessment/grade (due dates are given in the Course Outline).

1. **Class participation (40%):** This element includes class attendance and engagement in and contributions to weekly discussions of assigned readings. It also includes participation in in-class preparation for and review of homework. There are two types of homework: **(A)** exercises in the use of **methods** and **(B)** steps related to the **IRB** (institutional review board) **application process**. In the Course Outline, homework assignments are labeled by letter and title (bolded in preceding sentence). In the class prior to each homework exercise, we will discuss what is expected; in the class in which the exercise is due, we will reflect critically on the exercise. We might also briefly revisit completed exercises in the following class to give us all an opportunity to share any additional reflections.
2. **Questions for classroom discussion of readings (10%):** At least 4 times during the semester, each student must submit a thoughtful and thought-provoking question based on one or more of the assigned readings. I encourage you to space out your submissions to avoid having to rush to fulfill this requirement as the term's end approaches or getting caught at its end without completing this

assignment. Each question must be submitted to me electronically by midnight on the Monday prior to the class in which the associated reading/s will be discussed.

3. **Methods Exercises 1-10 (40%):** Between class meetings, you will each conduct a series of 10 exercises on various qualitative research methods. Due dates are indicated in the Course Outline. These exercises are described at the end of the syllabus. They focus on engaging in research activity and reflecting critically concerning what you learned about the research process, the topic, phenomenon, or question(s) under study, and, importantly, yourself as a researcher. The written portion of methods exercises 1-3 and 6-9 must be submitted in hard copy, whereas exercises 4-5 and 10 must be submitted electronically to me at kammerer@brandeis.edu.
4. **Final Essay (10%):** In lieu of a final paper, the last homework exercise is a short essay/memo reflecting on your current perspectives on research in light of course readings, methods exercises, and discussions, as well as other work during the semester and your previous training and experience. Submit it electronically by midnight on Wednesday, December 12. See the description at the end of the list of methods exercises that follows the Course Outline.

Assessment: The assessment/grade for participation will be based more on content, contribution to the ongoing discussion, responsiveness to the thoughts of others, and evidence of cumulative learning (quality) than on frequency (quantity). The methods exercises are a chance for all of us to experience and explore conducting various elements of data collection, analysis, and write up, so the doing is what counts towards credit. Don't be afraid of making mistakes! Be courageous, curious, and creative and we'll all learn more. The same holds true for in-class discussions. The assessment/grade for the final essay/memo will be based on both content and effectiveness of communication. Spelling, grammar, organization, and clarity of expression are all elements in the effectiveness of communication.

Computer-assisted Qualitative Data Analysis Software (CAQDAS): Qualitative software packages can be helpful in managing data and in data analysis. Please note the word 'assisted'. Unlike statistical software, qualitative software assists in rather than runs analyses. You are encouraged to take advantage of access to Atlas.ti and training therein available through Library and Technology Services (LTS). No Fall Semester trainings on CAQDAS are yet posted on the LTS website. During the semester, either scheduled trainings will be announced or we will arrange a training for our class (attendance optional). Additionally, selected articles on CAQDAS and its use will be posted at the end of our LATTE course.

Learning Objectives: Students who complete this course will have demonstrated some ability to:

1. Evidence knowledge of epistemological underpinnings of qualitative research.
2. Design a qualitative study or the qualitative portion of a mixed methods study of a policy-relevant topic.
3. Collect data qualitatively through direct observation, participant observation, and interviewing.
4. Assess strengths and weaknesses of reports and publications based on qualitative research.
5. Exhibit understanding of ethical issues in qualitative research.
6. Show familiarity with the IRB application process.

Course Outline (subject to revision) – Note that additional readings on various topics discussed are or will be available at the bottom of our LATTE course.

REMINDER: On this syllabus, assigned readings are listed ON THE DAY ON WHICH THEY ARE TO BE DISCUSSED.

**August 29
Week 1: INTRODUCTIONS**

- Course organization, requirements, responsibilities, mechanics, etc.
- What it means to be a seminar.
- The semester-long work, first, of collaboratively creating guidelines expressing our shared interactional values and, subsequently, of enacting those values to foster a “brave space” within our seminar, so that together we can examine difficult and emotionally charged issues of diversity, privilege, and power in assigned readings, study designs, and theoretical approaches considered in the course and, importantly, in our seminar community, Heller, and society in the US and beyond. “Advancing social justice,” our Heller mission, is impossible without attention to privilege, power, and oppression.
- Each student’s core policy interests and dissertation plans, however preliminary.
- Ways to tailor the course to students’ interests and needs.
- CADQAS training.

September 5

Week 2: EPISTEMOLOGIES AND ETHICS

READING – Due Today

1. Becker, Howard S., The Epistemology of Qualitative Research, In *Ethnography and Human Development: Context and Meaning in Social Inquiry*, Richard Jessor, Anne Colby and Richard A. Schweder, Eds., Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996, pp. 53-72.
2. Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo, and Gianpaolo Baiocchi, Anything but Racism: How Sociologists Limit the Significance of Racism, In *White Logic, White Methods; Racism and Methodology*, Tukufu Zuberi and Eduardo Bonilla-Silva, Eds., Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2008, pp. 137-151.
3. Charmaz, Kathy, Glossary, In *Constructing Grounded Theory: A Practical Guide through Qualitative Analysis*, pp. 341-345; Read entries on Chicago school sociology, Constructivism, Constructivist grounded theory, Objectivist grounded theory, Positivism, Postmodernism, Pragmatism, Social constructionism, and Symbolic interactionism.
4. (re)Read *The Belmont Report* (LATTE or <https://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/regulations-and-policy/belmont-report/read-the-belmont-report/index.html>).

HOMEWORK – Due September 12

(A) METHODS: Exercise I: Direct Observation I & II

CIRCULATED: Sign-up sheet for one-on-one meetings. Each of you must meet with me to discuss your research interests. If no available slot works for you, please speak with me so we can find a mutually convenient time.

September 12

Week 3: EPISTEMOLOGIES CONTINUED; FRAMEWORK ANALYSIS

READING – Due Today

1. Janesick, Valerie J., The Choreography of Qualitative Research Design: Minuets, Improvisations, and Crystallization, In *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research, 2nd Edition*, Norman K. Denzin and Yvonna S. Lincoln, Eds., Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2000, pp. 379-399.
2. Geertz, Clifford, Thick Description: Toward an Interpretive Theory of Culture, In *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays*, New York: Basic Books, 1973, pp. 3-7.
3. Spencer, Liz, et al., *Quality in Qualitative Evaluation: A Framework for Assessing Research Evidence*, London: Cabinet Office, Strategy Unit.
4. Ritchie, Jane, and Liz Spencer, Qualitative Data Analysis for Applied Policy Research, In *The Qualitative Researcher’s Companion: Classic and Contemporary Readings*, Chapter 9, A. Michael Huberman and Douglas Miles, Eds., Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2002(1994), pp. 305-330.

HOMEWORK – Due September 26

(A) METHODS: Exercise 2: Participation Observation I

REMINDER: Start reading *Learning from Strangers* (entire volume), to be discussed October 3).
September 19 – NO CLASS

September 26

Week 4: THEORY, ETHNOGRAPHY, AUTOETHNOGRAPHY, SELF AND REFLEXIVITY IN RESEARCH READING – Due Today

1. Crenshaw, Kimberlé, Neil Gotanda, and Garry Peller, Introduction, In *Critical Race Theory: The Key Writings that Formed the Movement*, New York: The New Press, 1995, pp. xiii-xxxii.
2. Duncan, Garrett Albert, Beyond Love: A Critical Race Ethnography of the Schooling of Black Male Adolescents, *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 35(2)(2002), pp. 131-143.
3. Estrada, Emir, and Pierrette Hondagneu-Sotelo, Intersectional Dignities: Latino Immigrant Street Vendor Youth in Los Angeles, *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 40(1)(2011), pp. 102-131.
4. Anderson, Leon, Analytical Autoethnography, *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 35(4)(2006), pp. 373-395.

HOMEWORK – Due October 3

(A) METHODS: Exercise 3: Participant Observation II

October 3

Week 5: INTERVIEWING

READING – Due Today

1. Weiss, Robert S., *Learning from Strangers*, pp. 1-150 (plus associated endnotes) and pp. 207-218.

HOMEWORK – Due electronically by 8PM on Sunday, October 7

(A) METHODS: Exercise 4: Interviewing I

Reminder: Start reading Kathy Charmaz's *Constructing Grounded Theory* (entire volume), to be discussed on October 17.

October 10

Week 6: CASE STUDIES AND INSTITUTIONAL ETHNOGRAPHY

READING– Due Today

1. Baxter, Pamela, and Susan Jack, Qualitative Case Study Methodology: Study Design and Implementation for Novice Researchers, *The Qualitative Report*, 13(4)(2008), pp. 544-559.
2. Flyvbjerg, Bent, Five Misunderstandings about Case Study Research, *Qualitative Inquiry*, 12(2)(2006), pp. 219-245.
3. Smith, Dorothy E., Defining an Ontology for Institutional Ethnography, In *Institutional Ethnography: A Sociology for People*. The Gendered Lens Series. Lanham, MD: Altamira Press, 2005, pp. 49-73.
4. Campbell, Marie L. Intersectionality, Policy-oriented Research and the Social Relations of Knowing, *Gender, Work, & Organization*, 23(3)(2016), pp. 248-260.

HOMEWORK – Due (A) electronically by 8PM on Sunday, October 14 and (B) by class October 24

(A) METHODS: Exercise 5: Interviewing II

(B) IRB APPLICATION PROCESS:

(1) Access and explore the website of the Brandeis IRB, also known as the Brandeis Committee for Protection of Human Subjects (BCPHS), at <http://www.brandeis.edu/osp/hsintro.html>.

(2) Read the IRB materials handed out in class.

NOTE: I assume that first-year students will do the Citi Training in association with the Research Methods class and that second-year students did it last year. For those who already have a certificate, if you have not done so yet, create a file for it, as you need to maintain a record of having completed the training. For those who do the training this year, remember to store your certificate for easy access.

HANDED OUT: Forms and guidelines from the Brandeis IRB handed out in class.

October 17

Week 7: GROUNDED THEORY

READING – Due Today

1. Charmaz, Kathy, *Constructing Grounded Theory* (entire volume).

HOMEWORK – Due October 24

(A) METHODS: Exercise 6: Interviewing III

INTERVIEW PAIRINGS: Drawing names

REMINDER: Start reading Bayla Ostrach's *Health Policy in a Time of Crisis* (entire volume), to be discussed October 31.

October 24

Week 8: TRANSCRIPTION, PHOTOGRAPHY, AND PHOTOVOICE

READING – Due Today

1. Oliver, Daniel G., Juliane M. Serovich, and Tina L. Mason, Constraints and Opportunities with Interview Transcription: Towards Reflection in Qualitative Research, *Social Forces*, 84(2)(2005), pp. 1273-1289.
2. Harper, Douglas, Talking about Pictures: A Case for Photo Elicitation, *Visual Studies*, 17(1)(2002), pp. 13-26.
3. Wang, Caroline C., et al., Flint Photovoice: Community Building among Youths, Adults, and Policymakers, *American Journal of Public Health*, 94(6)(2004), pp. 911-913.
4. Wang, Caroline C., and Yanique A. Redwood-Jones, Photovoice Ethics: Perspectives from Flint Photovoice, *Health Education & Behavior*, 28(5)(2001), pp. 560-572.

IN-CLASS EXERCISE I: Discuss IRB application process.

IN-CLASS EXERCISE II: Brainstorm about what to consider while reading the monograph.

HOMEWORK: Due October 31

(A) METHODS: Exercise 7: Interviewing IV

October 31

Week 9: ETHNOGRAPHY

READING – Due Today

1. Ostrach, Bayla, *Health Policy in a Time of Crisis*.

HOMEWORK – Due November 7

(A) METHODS: Exercise 8: Interviewing V

INTERVIEW PAIRINGS: Drawing names

November 7

Week 10: PARTICIPANT OBSERVATION AND INTERVIEWING REVISITED, MIXED METHODS, AND NARRATIVE ANALYSIS

READING – Due Today

1. Becker, Howard S., and Geer, Blanche, Participant Observation and Interviewing: A Comparison, *Human Organization*, 16(3)(1957), pp. 28-32.
2. Bazeley, Patricia, Editorial: Integrating Data Analysis in Mixed Methods Research, *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 3(3)(2009), pp. 203-207.
3. Creswell, John W., Klassen, Ann C., Plano Clark, Vicki L., and Clegg Smith, Katherine C. for the Office of Behavioral and Social Sciences Research, *Best Practices for Mixed Methods Research in the Health Sciences*, 2011.
4. Mishler, Elliot G., Models of Narrative Analysis, *Journal of Narrative and Life History*, 5(2)(1995), pp. 87-123 (skim if you wish).

HOMEWORK – Due November 14

(A) METHODS: Exercise 9: Interviewing VI

November 14

Week 11: ETHNOGRAPHY AND ETHICS REVISITED

READING – Due Today

1. Evans, Nancy J., The Impact of an LGBT Safe Zone Project on Campus Climate, *Journal of College Student Development*, 43(4)(2002), pp. 522-538.
2. Smith-Morris, Carolyn, et al., Ethnography, Fidelity, and the Evidence that Anthropology Adds: Supplementing the Fidelity Process in a Clinical Trial of Supported Employment, *Medical Anthropology Quarterly*, 28(2)(2014), pp. 41-61.
3. Hopper, Kim, The Murky Middle Ground – When Ethnographers Engage Public Health, *Social Science & Medicine*, 99(2013), pp. 201-204.
4. Anspach, Renée, and Mizrahi, Nissim, The Field Worker's Fields: Ethics, Ethnography, and Medical Sociology, *Sociology of Health & Illness*, 28(6)(2006), pp. 713-731.

HOMEWORK – Due electronically by 8PM on Tuesday, November 27

(A) METHODS: Exercise 10: Memoing

NO CLASS: November 21 – HAPPY THANKSGIVING!

November 28

Week 12: PARTICIPATORY RESEARCH, POLITICS, AND POLICY

READING – Due Today

1. Freire, Paulo, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, Mayra Bergman Ramos, trans., New York: Continuum, Chapter 1, 2000 (1971), pp. 43-70.
2. Freire, Paulo, and Donaldo P. Macedo, A Dialogue: Culture, Language, and Race, *Harvard Education Review*, 65(3)(1995), pp. 377-402.
3. Viswanathan M., et al., *Community-Based Participatory Research: Assessing the Evidence*. Evidence Report/Technology Assessment No. 99 (Prepared by RTI–University of North Carolina Evidence-based Practice Center under Contract No. 290-02-0016). AHRQ Publication 04-E022-2. Rockville, MD: Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality. July 2004, pp. 1-8.
4. Brabeck, Kalina, et al. Ethical Ambiguities of Participatory Action Research With Unauthorized Migrants, *Ethics & Behavior*, 2(1)(2015), pp. 21-36

HOMEWORK: Remember that your **FINAL ESSAY** is due electronically by midnight on December 12.

December 5

Week 13: FOCUS GROUPS AND WRITING

READING – Due Today

1. Parker, Andrew, and Jonathan Tritter, Focus Group Method and Methodology: Current Practice and Recent Debate, *International Journal of Research and Method in Education*, 29(1)(2006), pp. 23-37.
2. Kirst, Nelson, The LOG – *Levantamento de Opinião em Grupo* – Focus Group Method, translated by Julia Kirst, 2008, manuscript.
3. Fullilove, Mindy Thompson, Lown, E. Anne, and Fullilove, Robert, Crack 'Hos and Skeezers: Traumatic Experiences of Women Crack Users, *Journal of Sex Research*, 29(2)(1992), pp. 275-287.
4. Lamott, Anne, "Short Assignments," "Shitty First Drafts," and "Perfectionism," In *Bird by Bird: Some Instructions on Writing and Life*, New York: Anchor Books, 1995(1994), pp. 16-32.

FINAL ESSAY: Submit electronically by midnight on Wednesday, December 12.

Methods Exercises (subject to revision):

In Methods Exercises 1-3, do not conduct your research in a Heller or Brandeis setting or with family or friends.

1. DIRECT OBSERVATION I & II: Complete two sessions of observation (no interviewing, no participation) each approximately a half hour in duration at the same venue. In choosing a site, make sure to consider safety issues. The observation periods must be separated by at minimum the time it takes you to write up notes after the initial period, as described in the next two sentences. During the first session do not take notes, but do your best to observe and remember. Then write up your observations as soon as possible after the session. During the second session, record detailed field notes. You now have two sets of field notes, one recorded after the fact and the other recorded during observation. Each of these sets of field notes should describe the setting, people, interactions, and activities observed. Now write up reflections on your findings and the experience of doing direct observation. This write-up should address what you consider important and questions such as the following. Why did you choose the setting you did? What are the differences between what you recorded during the first observation session and the second? How would you account for these differences? Would other people have interpreted the setting differently? What questions did you take into the field? Did you find what you expected to find and, if not, what accounts for differences between your expectations and what you observed? How did people in the setting react to you, if at all? Do you think your presence influenced what people you observed did? If so, how and why? What did it feel like to be an observer? Did your feelings differ in the two sessions? Which note-taking method do you prefer and why? How did the first observation session affect the second? How would you improve your observations if you were to do these exercises again? Bring your write-up and fieldnotes to class and hand them in at the end.

2. PARTICIPANT OBSERVATION I: Choose a public venue or event in which to do participant observation for a half hour or more. In choosing your field site, make sure that you think in advance about how you will be a participant and an observer as opposed to just an observer. Again, in choosing a site, make sure to consider safety issues. As with the initial direct observation session, do not take field notes. Instead do your best to remember the people, setting, interactions, and activities. Write up your field notes as soon as possible after you finish the research. In your write-up, describe the people, setting, interactions, and activities. Include your participation. Once you have finished your write-up, write your reflections on the exercise, addressing whatever you consider important and questions such as the following. Why did you choose the venue or event you did? On what basis did you think it would be a suitable field site for participant observation? Did it turn out to be as suitable as you thought and, if not, in what ways was it not suitable? What questions did you take to your chosen field site? On what basis did you formulate those questions? How did your participant observation address those questions? Why did you participate in the ways you did? How did your participation affect what you observed? What did you do well and what might you have done better in the research? What did you learn about both doing participant observation and your chosen subject? Bring your write-up/reflections and field notes to class and hand them in at the end.

3. PARTICIPANT OBSERVATION II: Choose a second venue or event or return to your first field site. Conduct a second session of participant observation for a half hour or more. This time take field notes during research about the people, setting, interactions, and activities. After you complete the participant observation session, reread your field notes and think back on the session itself. Do not alter those notes, but separately record any changes or additions you think are important. You can do this on your original notes as long as you make sure that later additions are evident, for example, written in ink of a different color. Then write up your critical reflections on the experience and on what you learned about both the enterprise of participant observation and your chosen subject. Compare the experience and results of conducting participant observation with and without taking notes

concurrently. You might also choose to indicate what new or reformulated question(s) you would take back to another session at the same field site. Discuss what you did well and how you might improve your research if you were to do it again. Bring your write-up/reflections and field notes to class and hand them in at the end.

4. INTERVIEWING I: In this exercise you will develop a guide for the interview that you will do in subsequent homework exercises, in which you will interview one another. As you think about what topic(s) to explore in the interview, be sure to keep in mind that we will be discussing the guides and the interviews in class, as well as the fact that you will need to write up about the interview as part of the homework assignment for Interviewing II. Find something to explore that is interesting and complex but neither private nor potentially disturbing to your interviewee. Do **not** develop your guide with a particular classmate in mind as interviewee. In developing the guide, avoid using yes/no questions, and also avoid introducing terms or phrases that might overly shape the interviewee's response or would be better left to the interviewee to introduce. Think about what you wish to learn and how best to get at the topic(s) you've chosen to explore, as well as how to permit the interviewee to introduce information they considers relevant to your chosen topic. In preparing your guide, I encourage you to consider the interview as a process that has an opening and a closing with a rich center in between devoted to exploring the interviewee's perspectives and experiences. I am asking you to develop the guide before you pair up for the interviews so that you will write a guide appropriate to a category of people rather than an individual or about experiences every student has likely had. After you have developed your guide, write up your reflections on the process. Issues to consider include why you chose the topic(s) you did, how you went about forming and phrasing the topics to be explored, and why you structured the guide the way you did. Email your guide and reflections to me at kammerer@brandeis.edu by 8PM on Sunday, October 7. Please meet the submission deadline to give me time to read and comment prior to class on October 10.

5. INTERVIEWING II: Revise your guide based on class discussion, written feedback, and your further reflections. Also, briefly characterize and explain the changes made. Email your guide and reflections to me at kammerer@brandeis.edu by 8PM on Sunday, October 14.

6. INTERVIEWING III: In this exercise, you will interview each other. Pairings will be established by drawing a name from a hat. Each pair will need to meet either for two sessions, each lasting a half hour to an hour, or for one long session. The sooner you meet and conduct the interviews the better, in order to leave time for writing up. Approach the interview as an exploration, done with the help of your interview guide, in which attending to what you are seeking to learn does not prevent you from being profoundly attuned to what your respondent is saying. Remember that in an interview you should speak much less than your interviewee.

Record the interview and also take notes. Do **not** listen to the tape recording for this exercise. In preparation for conducting the interview, we will discuss in class what forms your notes might take.

The written part of this homework exercise has two parts, one for each role you played. Both should be based on your memory, and the interviewer write-up should also be based on your notes.

(1) *Interviewer write-up:* Briefly summarize what you learned about the topic(s) chosen, but focus your energy on analyzing the interview process itself. Describe the dynamics of the interview, what you did well, what you would do differently, and what you learned about the interview process and yourself as an interviewer.

(2) *Interviewee write-up:* Reflect on the experience of being interviewed and what you learned from it about being an interviewee. Also reflect on the dynamics of the interview, what the interviewer did well and might have done better, as well as what you learned about being an interviewer from being interviewed and from observing someone else interviewing. Bring your write-ups to class and hand them in at the end.

7. INTERVIEWING IV: In this exercise, you are to do three things. First, listen to the entire tape of the interview you conducted. Second, transcribe a portion of that tape. You do not need to transcribe the entire interview, but you need to get a feel for the challenges of the task. Transcribe approximately 3 pages, with at least half a page

of the transcription in naturalistic style. Third, write up your critical reflections on the following two issues. In doing so, relate your reflections to the assigned readings and class discussion on interviewing and transcribing.

(1) *The process of transcribing*: Be sure to consider the issues and choices you encountered in the transcription process, as well as what decisions you made and why.

(2) *How your understanding of the interview based only on your notes and your memory (so, what you wrote up for last week's methods exercise homework) differs from your understanding after listening to the tape of the interview and transcribing a portion of it*: You should consider not only your understanding of the content of the interview, but also the interview dynamics and what you did well and might have done better as an interviewer.

Bring your transcription **and** write-up/reflections to class and hand them in at the end.

8. INTERVIEWING V: Using the interview guide from methods exercise 6, interview a different class member. Again, pairings will be made by drawing names. Prepare your write-up in two stages. First, based solely on your memory and notes (if any), reflect on the interview dynamics, commenting on what you did well and not so well and what you hope to improve. Second, after listening to the tape, examine the same issues, with emphasis on how and why your assessment of the interview dynamics changed once you heard the interview. Bring your write-ups to class and hand them in at the end.

9. INTERVIEWING VI: Watch the assigned taped interview from the HistoryMakers Digital Archive, an oral history interview project with African Americans, and write-up your assessment of the dynamics. Bring your write-up to class and hand it in at the end.

10. MEMOING: Write a short memo (approximately 3 pages) on your current thoughts about the theoretical perspectives and concepts you find most fruitful and important. The focus should be on where your thinking is at this point. Characterize your current analytical framework, whatever its source, whether discussed in this course or not. What analytical lenses do you use to understand the social issues of interest to you and to inform related policies? Why? How do the lenses you have chosen intersect with or complement one another? How are these lenses relevant to your dissertation project in terms of shaping both your questions and your choice of methods? Note that this is an opportunity to try out memo writing, as well as to do a bit of auto-ethnography in the form of interrogating your analytical framework. Email your memo to me at kammerer@brandeis.edu by 8PM on Monday, November 26th.

Final Essay:

In a short essay (aka memo) of 5 or so pages, describe your current thinking about yourself as a researcher and about research design, data collection, and analysis in relation to your likely dissertation topic. Having just articulated your theoretical perspective in the final Methods Exercise, you might discuss its relationship to your present position with respect to study design, data collection, and analysis for your dissertation project, however preliminary your ideas about all that are at this point. This is an opportunity to reflect on what you have learned about yourself as a researcher and on the research process and tools, including dimensions you see clearly and those about which you have doubts or questions or need to read and think more. It is a chance to surface what you know and what you don't, ways your perspective is changing, and your path forward as a researcher. Email your essay/memo to me at kammerer@brandeis.edu by midnight on Wednesday, December 12.