

**Review of Research in Educational Studies:  
Qualitative Research Interviewing**  
EDST 508A, Section 941

<b>Instructor:</b>	Deirdre Kelly	<b>Term:</b>	Summer 1 (May 14-June 20, 2018)
<b>Office:</b>	Ponderosa Commons 3039	<b>Time:</b>	Mon., Wed. 1-4 p.m.
<b>Tel:</b>	604-822-3952	<b>Classroom:</b>	PCOH 1215
<b>Fax:</b>	604-822-4244	<b>E-mail:</b>	deirdre.kelly@ubc.ca

The simple thing to say is that interview research is research conducted by talking with people. . . This simple view, however appealing, neglects the fascinating complexity of human talk—the flexibility and productive powers of language; the subtle shades of meaning conveyed through the nuances of speech, gesture, and expression; issues of translation; the ineluctable locatedness of any moment or stretch of talk; the specialized vocabularies of particular settings and groups; the organizing effects of format and genre; the injuries and uses of silence; the challenges inherent in listening; and so on. The simple view also neglects the dynamics of power involved in any empirical research... (Devault & Gross, 2012, p. 206).

In this course, I aim to take a reflexive, pragmatic approach to qualitative research interviewing:

Reflexivity ... includes opening up the phenomena through exploring more than one set of meanings and acknowledging ambiguity in the phenomena and the line(s) of inquiry favored, and it means bridging the gap between epistemological concerns and method. Pragmatism means balancing endless reflexivity and radical skepticism with a sense of direction and accomplishment. (Alvesson, 2003, p. 14)

Just as in life, in research too we have to make choices in difficult, uncertain circumstances and cope with competing demands and responsibilities. It is these choices that ethical reflexivity brings to our attention. (Finlay, 2012, p. 328)

On a fundamental level, reflexivity is about giving as full and honest an account of the research process as possible, in particular explicating the position of the researcher in relation to the research. However, there is a paradox implicit in reflexivity. We explicate the processes and positions we are aware of being caught up in. But inevitably some of the influences arising from aspects of social identity remain beyond the reflexive grasp. (Reay, 2012, p. 637)

### ***Course Description***

This seminar will allow students to examine the methodological, technical, and ethical demands of doing qualitative research interviewing. *Qualitative* is an umbrella term used to encompass terms such as in-depth, narrative, and ethnographic interviewing. Course readings will draw primarily from anthropological, sociological, feminist, and critical educational studies approaches to explore how interviewing is understood and practiced. The seminar is built on the assumption that qualitative interviewers learn best by doing and then reflecting on those

experiences. Thus, the course will include practical activities and assignments aimed at helping students to develop or hone their research skills. Topics will include: the epistemological foundations of qualitative interviewing; designing a qualitative interview study; the ethics of doing interviews; strategies for interviewing; planning for fieldwork; the use of observations and field notes in interview projects; positionality and power dynamics; methods for managing, transcribing, and analyzing interview data; researcher reflexivity; and presentation of interview data in written reports. A theme in the course will be the importance of reflecting on, and articulating rationales for, choices as one designs, conducts, and communicates one's research.

<b>SCHEDULE OF TOPICS AND DUE DATES</b>		
1	Mon. May 14	Introduction and overview; possibilities and limitations of interviewing
2	Wed. May 16	Debates; reflexivity as a lens
	Mon. May 21	VICTORIA DAY (no class)
3	Wed. May 23	3 Roles: Interviewer, interviewee, participant-observer; informal reflections on assigned reading due in class
4	Mon. May 28	Theorizing the research interview; Group A interviewed by Group B; field notes due (later that night or no later than May 29 by 9 a.m.)
	Mon. May 28	Reflexive Review assignment due via Canvas by noon
5	Wed. May 30	Designing interview studies; group-interview considerations
6	Mon. June 4	Doing interviews: Question types and elicitation techniques; Group B interviewed by Group C; transcript/reflections due for Group B
7	Wed. June 6	Doing interviews: Recruitment, selection, observation, and field notes
8	Mon. June 11	Doing interviews: Ethics, insider-outsider continuum; Group C interviewed by Group A
9	Wed. June 13	Positionality and power dynamics (interviewing across difference); transcript/reflections due for Group C; possible guest panel discussion
10	Mon. June 18	Transcription, data management, data analysis
11	Wed. June 20	Data analysis and presentation; judging quality; transcript/reflections due for Group A
--	Sun. June 24	Final assignment (1 of 4 options) due

### ***Course Requirements & Evaluation***

NOTE: I encourage you to work together with other members of the class on any assignment. If you elect to do this, you will receive a group mark.

<b>OVERVIEW &amp; WEIGHTING OF ASSIGNMENTS</b>	
<b>Assignment:</b>	<b>Weighting:</b>
Reflexive review of an interview-based study	30
Initial triad interviewing experience (pass/fail)	0
Interview experience (transcription, reflection)	30
Final assignment (1 of 4 options)	40

### **Reflexive Review of an Interview-Based Study**

As we will discuss in class, the concept of *reflexivity* is understood differently within different traditions. The purpose of this assignment is to exercise your capacity for reflexivity by inquiring into the various key decisions that have been made (or not made) by researcher/s, as reflected in one refereed, scholarly journal article that uses interviews as the main data source. The article could be, for example, one you have read before, that is important or cited a lot in your area of interest, or that your program advisor or thesis supervisor has recommended.

As you read the article, ask yourself these sorts of questions: What is the author trying to do? Why did s/he conduct the interview study in the way that they did? How did their approach affect the research? Does the method reflect the research question/s posed? Was the theoretical approach to the study and to interviewing consistent with how the data were analyzed and represented? The main body of your paper should be focused on answering these kinds of questions. In your conclusion, please reflect briefly on the strengths and limitations of the particular approach to interviewing in evidence in the article that you have reviewed in relation to the approach you hope to take in your own study. 5-7 pages. At the end of your paper, please include a full citation, including DOI or stable URL, to the article you selected for analysis.

Due on: **May 28** via Canvas by noon (worth 30%)

NOTE: Given the cumulative nature of the tasks in the next assignments and the steep learning curve, I emphasize *formative assessment*. It would be unfair to give students marks in the earlier stages (for mini-assignments). Equally, it is important to have close review of students' work as you start to learn the skills of interviewing. Thus, the formative assignments are pass/fail.

### **Initial Triad Interviewing Experience** (2 parts) (pass/fail)

1. Informal reflections and preparatory notes for your initial role (to be assigned in class), keying off the assigned reading (Warner for the interviewer role, Foley for the respondent role, and Ellingson for the observer role). 1 page; **due May 23**
2. Field notes on your observations, insights, and questions in your initial assigned role. 1-2 pages; **due May 23** (later that night, ideally, but no later than **May 24 by 9 a.m.**)

## **Reflection on an Interview Experience (2 parts)**

Formative-assessment part (pass/fail): Transcript of 20-minute audio-recorded interview where you were the interviewer (guidelines to be discussed in class); **due 3 classes after your interview.**

Transcription formatting guidelines: single-spaced, with 2 hard returns (line break) between interviewer and interviewee text; left margin 1 inch; right margin 3 inches (to allow for commentary); add line numbers (in MS Word: on the Page Layout tab, in the Page Setup group, click Line Numbers) running consecutively; add running header or footer on each page with your last name, the date of the interview, and page number included. (Example to be posted on Canvas and discussed in class.) This formatting will allow you to make easy reference to specific passages in your reflection (see description just below).

Summative-assessment part (graded): Reflect on the interview process, including the choices you made as the interviewer, the challenges and surprises you encountered, the nature of the role, and questions arising. For example, did the interview questions generate the kind of data anticipated? Would questions need to be reworded, rethought, or re-ordered? What parts of the interview worked well, and why? What parts worked less well, and why? Think about such things as rapport, flow, wait time, etc. You might also consider Donald Schon's (1995) distinction between "reflection-*in-action*" (reflexivity exercised spontaneously during the interview when there were opportunities to change course) and reflection *on* those earlier reflections-*in-action*. Please make references to the *Initial Triad Interviewing Experience*, as appropriate, and especially to the interview transcript (including line numbers) in your reflection. Maximum 5 pages.

Due on: **June 6 (Group B); June 13 (Group C); June 20 (Group A)** (worth 30%)

## **Final Assignment: Choose one of four options**

I recognize that you are all at different stages in your programs and come from a variety of disciplinary backgrounds. I see the final assignment as allowing you to synthesize and demonstrate what you have been learning and reading about this term. You can do this in a variety of ways. Please pick one of the following options. In all cases, your final paper should refer to course readings, activities, and discussions. Depending on which option you select, the final paper will be 5 to 10 pages.

Option 1: Arrange with me **no later than June 4** an opportunity to generate another round of data, like what we have done as an in-class activity with a classmate. Reflect on the data-generating activity, considering the previous round of interviewing and course readings. This might be done as a compare-and-contrast or a comparison of two rounds of a similar form of interviewing (i.e., narrative, taxonomic, phenomenological).

Option 2: Select for analysis a subset (minimum of two, beyond the one where you were the interviewer) of the interview transcripts generated in class, which will be posted on Canvas as they are produced by you and your classmates. Reflect on the different kinds

of data generated, both based on different forms of interviewing and different interviewer-interviewee dynamics. In other words, make sure your discussion focuses not only on the interview transcripts as “vessels of topics,” but also as “speech events” and “social interactions” (Warren, 2012, p. 130). Be sure to give examples, citing the interviewer’s last name and transcript lines of each illustrative excerpt.

**Option 3:** Reflect on choices you have made, and those you still must make, in designing your own interview-based study. For example, what ethical dilemmas and questions have arisen thus far in your research project? What strategies might you use to address them? This assignment might take the form of a mini-proposal, where you indicate the problem or issue you wish to explore, why the type of interviewing that you propose to do is an appropriate method of data collection, your rationale for the people you want to interview, and how you will recruit and gain consent. Include a preliminary interview guide (list of interview questions and prompts).

**Option 4:** Pick an issue in interviewing that you want to learn more about and do some additional reading and reflection. An example might be interviewing people who speak English as an additional language. Another might be about how you plan to represent yourself and your participants in your research project: How will embodiment feature? In which contexts might exposing the researcher’s personal situation advance a research project, and in which contexts not? Present a synopsis and synthesis of key ideas across the readings you have selected, discuss how your understanding of this issue has expanded, and note questions arising from your inquiry. Be sure to discuss the implications for your future work.

### **Assessment Criteria that Apply to All Assignments**

For all assignments, I will be looking at organization, clarity, and conciseness. You should carefully proofread for grammar, spelling, and punctuation errors.

#### Development & Organization of Argument:

- Develops coherent, defensible, and original argument;
- Includes various perspectives, including those developed from experience, and is appropriately critical (believing and doubting) of those perspectives;
- Creates cogent argument that provides logical and fully articulated transitions;
- Provides suitable evidence and examples.

NOTE: Please follow APA (6<sup>th</sup> edition) style for all written work for this class. This includes double-spacing and margins (1 in. or 2.54 cm on each edge). Please number all pages.

### ***Class Participation and the Importance of Journaling***

Everyone should come to class prepared to discuss the assigned readings. Class members will learn as much from the exchange of views inside the classroom as we will from analyzing the readings on our own. Furthermore, and especially in an activities-rich class such as Interviewing, the success of our work as a collaborative venture depends on respectful and attentive class participation by all members. For example, each of you will rotate among the

interviewer, interviewee, and participant-observer roles over the course of the term. In some moments, you will need to be open to constructive feedback. In other moments, you will need to be sensitive to the tone and manner with which you offer feedback.

I strongly encourage you to begin keeping a research journal. At this stage, it may be more focused on ideas that come to you, based on your reading and class participation. Journaling serves as an aid to reflexivity, because it creates a record of how and why your thinking is evolving. Use your journal to capture ideas and feelings through writing, drawing, and mapping. Use it to record and explain the multiple and evolving decisions that will comprise part, or all, of the design of your interview-based study. In later stages, you can use it as a place to jot down possible themes and codes and the sources of your ideas about these. Eventually, you will be able to draw on your journal when you write the methodology section or chapter of your thesis.

### ***Course Readings***

The readings are available free of charge as e-journal articles or e-book chapters through UBC library. Some book chapters will only be available through the Library Course Reserve section of the course shell in Canvas; available at: <http://lthub.ubc.ca/guides/canvas/>

***For additional course policies, please see Syllabus Addendum posted on Canvas.***

### ***Detailed Schedule of Topics, Readings, & Activities***

#### **May 14: Introduction and Overview. Possibilities and Limitations of Interviewing. Logistics of In-Class Interviewing Experience**

Please make sure that you are familiar with the Tri Council Policy Statement (TCPS); you are required to complete the TCPS Tutorial Course on Research Ethics (CORE), if you have not already done so. Here is the link: <http://www.pre.ethics.gc.ca/eng/education/tutorial-didacticiel/>

Reid, Colleen, Greaves, Lorraine, & Kirby, Sandra. (2017). Method 2: Interviews. In *Experience, research, social change: Critical methods* (3rd edition ed., pp. 148-164). Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press.

#### **May 16: Debates; Reflexivity as a Lens**

Kvale, Steinar. (2008). Conducting an interview. In *Doing interviews* (Book 2 of *The SAGE qualitative research kit*, pp. 52-67). London: Sage. <e-book>

Lamont, Michèle, & Swidler, Ann. (2014). Methodological pluralism and the possibilities and limits of interviewing. *Qualitative Sociology*, 37(2), 153–171.  
doi: 10.1007/s11133-014-9274-z

Finlay, Linda. (2012). Five lenses for the reflexive interviewer. In J. F. Gubrium, J. A. Holstein, A. B. Marvasti & K. D. McKinney (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of interview research: The complexity of the craft* (pp. 317-331). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

**May 21: Victoria Day Holiday – no class**

**May 23: Roles and Reflexivity: Interviewer, Interviewee, Participant-Observers**

Warren, Carol A. B. (2012). Interviewing as social interaction. In J. F. Gubrium, J. A. Holstein, A. B. Marvasti & K. D. McKinney (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of interview research: The complexity of the craft* (pp. 129-142). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Foley, Lara J. (2012). Constructing the respondent. In J. F. Gubrium, J. A. Holstein, A. B. Marvasti & K. D. McKinney (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of interview research: The complexity of the craft* (pp. 305-316). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Ellingson, Laura L. (2012). Interview as embodied communication. In J. F. Gubrium, J. A. Holstein, A. B. Marvasti & K. D. McKinney (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of interview research: The complexity of the craft* (pp. 525-539). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Brinkmann, Svend. (2016). Methodological breaching experiments: Steps toward theorizing the qualitative interview. *Culture & Psychology*, 22(4), 520–533. doi: 10.1177/1354067X16650816

**May 28: Theorizing the Research Interview — Reflexive Review assignment due**

Roulston, Kathryn. (2010). Chapter 3: Theorizing the qualitative interview. In *Reflective interviewing: A guide to theory and practice* (pp. 51-73). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Smith, Chris, & Elger, Tony. (2014). Critical realism and interviewing subjects. In P. K. Edwards, J. O'Mahoney & S. Vincent (Eds.), *Studying organizations using critical realism: A practical guide* (pp. 1-22 [e-book; 109-131 bound]): Oxford University Press. doi: 10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199665525.003.0006.

DeVault, Marjorie L. & Gross, Glenda. (2012). Feminist qualitative interviewing. In S. Nagy Hesse-Biber (Ed.), *Handbook of feminist research: Theory and praxis* (2nd ed., pp. 206-236). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Optional:

Alvesson, Mats. (2011). Views on interviews: A skeptical review *Interpreting interviews* (pp. 1-30 online; print pages: 39-42). London: SAGE Publications Ltd.

**May 30: Designing Interview Studies; Group-Interview Considerations**

Josselson, Ruthellen. (2013). Chapter 3: Planning the interview. In *Interviewing for qualitative inquiry: A relational approach* (pp. 35-53). New York: Guilford Press. <e-book, pp. 46-49>

Roulston, Kathryn. (2010). Chapter 4: Designing studies that use interviews. In *Reflective interviewing: A guide to theory and practice* (pp. 74-95). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Tuck, Eve. (2009). Suspending damage: A letter to communities. *Harvard Educational Review*, 79(3), 409-427. <https://doi-org.ezproxy.library.ubc.ca/10.17763/haer.79.3.n0016675661t3n15>

Optional:

Brinkmann, Svend. (2013). Excerpt from chapter 2: Research design in interview studies. In *Qualitative interviewing* (pp. 45-61). Oxford: Oxford University Press. <e-book>

Robinson, Jude. (2012). Using focus groups. In S. Delamont (Ed.), *Handbook of qualitative research in education* (pp. 391-404). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.

**June 4: Doing interviews: Question Types and Elicitation Techniques**

Tammivaara, Julie & Enright, D. Scott. (1986). On eliciting information: Dialogues with child informants. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 17, 218-238.

Schensul, Jean J. & LeCompte, Margaret D. (2013). In-depth, open-ended exploratory interviewing. In *Essential ethnographic methods: A mixed methods approach* (pp. 134-170). Lanham: AltaMira Press

Törrönen, Jukka. (2002). Semiotic theory on qualitative interviewing using stimulus texts. *Qualitative Research*, 2(3), 343-362. doi: 10.1177/146879410200200304.

Optional:

Seidman, Irving. (2013). Ch. 6: Technique isn't everything, but it is a lot. In *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and the social sciences* (4th ed., pp. 81-96). New York: Teachers College Press.

**June 6: Doing Interviews: Recruitment, Selection, Observation, and Field Notes**

Review Josselson, 2013, passage on Recruitment (pp. 38-41, e-book pp. 45-47).

Review Roulston, 2010, section on Approaches to *selection* and *sampling* of participants (pp. 81-83).

Wanat, Carolyn L. (2008). Getting past the gatekeepers: Differences between access and cooperation in public school research. *Field Methods*, 20(2), 191-208. doi: 10.1177/1525822X07313811

Lareau, Annette. (1989). Appendix: Common problems in field work: A personal essay. In *Home advantage: Social class and parental intervention in elementary education* (pp. 187-223). London: Falmer Press. **Focus on pp. 187-204.**

Warren, Carol A. B., & Karner, Tracy Xavia (2010). Writing fieldnotes. In *Discovering qualitative methods: Field research, interviews, and analysis* (pp. 107-125) New York: Oxford University Press.

**June 11: Doing Interviews: Ethics and Insider-Outsider Continuum**



- Heggen, Kristin & Guillemin, Marilys. (2012). Protecting participants' confidentiality using a situated research ethics approach. In J. F. Gubrium, J. A. Holstein, A. B. Marvasti & K. D. McKinney (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of interview research: The complexity of the craft* (pp. 465-476). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Metro, Rosalie. (2014). From the form to the face to face: IRBs, ethnographic researchers, and human subjects translate consent. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 45(2), 167-184. doi: 10/1111/aeq.12057.
- May, Reuben A. Buford. (2014). When the methodological shoe is on the other foot: African American interviewer and White interviewees. *Qualitative Sociology*, 37(1), 117-136. doi: 10.1007/s11133-013-9265-5.

**June 13:      Positionality and Power Dynamics: Interviewing Across Difference  
Possible guest panel to discuss distinct respondents (e.g., elites)**

- Reay, Diane (2012). Future directions in difference research. In S. Nagy Hesse-Biber (Ed.), *Handbook of feminist research: Theory and praxis* (2nd ed., pp. 627-640). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Becker, Sarah, & Aiello, Brittne. (2013). The continuum of complicity: “Studying up”/studying power as a feminist, anti-racist, or social justice venture. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 38, 63-74. doi: 10.1016/j.wsif.2013.02.004.
- NOTE WELL: If we do NOT have a guest panel on distinct respondents, we will instead do an in-class jigsaw activity, in which you will be assigned one of the readings listed below. We will discuss this in class and make a decision, based on students’ needs and interests.
- Biklen, Sari Knopp. (2004). Trouble on Memory Lane: Adults and self-retrospection in researching youth. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 10(5), 715-730. doi: 10.1177/1077800403261853
- González y González, Elsa M., & Lincoln, Yvonna S. (2006). Decolonizing qualitative research: Nontraditional reporting forms in the academy. In N. K. Denzin & M. D. Giardina (Eds.), *Qualitative inquiry and the conservative challenge* (pp. 175-191). Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press. < cross-cultural translation and bilingual data >
- Kong, Travis S., Mahoney, Dan, & Plummer, Ken. (2002). Queering the interview. In J. F. Gubrium & J. A. Holstein (Eds.), *The handbook of interview research: Context and method* (pp. 239–257). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Temple, Bogusia, & Young, Alys. (2004). Qualitative research and translation dilemmas. *Qualitative Research*, 4(2), 161-178. doi: 10.1177/1468794104044430

Vähäsantanen, Katja, & Saarinen, Jaana. (2013). The power dance in the research interview: Manifesting power and powerlessness. *Qualitative Research*, 13(5), 493–510. doi: 10.1177/1468794112451036. < age, gender, and profession >

### **June 18: Transcription, Data Management, and Preliminary Data Analysis**

Oliver, Daniel G., Serovich, Julianne M., & Mason, Tina L. (2005). Constraints and opportunities with interview transcription: Towards reflection in qualitative research. *Social Forces*, 84(2), 1273-1289. doi: 10.1353/sof.2006.0023.

Pratt, Geraldine (2002). Studying immigrants in focus groups. In P. Moss (Ed.), *Feminist geography in practice: Research and methods* (pp. 214-228). Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Review Lareau, especially pages 204-219.

Grbich, Carol (2007). During data collection: Preliminary data analysis; Post data collection: Thematic analysis. In *Qualitative data analysis: An introduction* (pp. 25-36). London: Sage Publications.

### **June 20: Data Analysis and Presentation; Judging Quality**

Braun, Virginia, & Clarke, Victoria. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77-101. doi: 10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Watson, Cate. (2012). Analysing narratives: The narrative construction of identity. In S. Delamont (Ed.), *Handbook of qualitative research in education* (pp. 460-474). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.

Roulston, Kathryn. (2010). Considering quality in qualitative interviewing. *Qualitative Research*, 10(2), 199-228. doi: 10.1177/1468794109356739.

#### Optional:

Guest, Greg, MacQueen, Kathleen M., & Namey, Emily E. (2012). Supplemental analytic techniques in *Applied thematic analysis* (pp. 107-129). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. doi: 10.4135/9781483384436.n5.

Seidman, Irving. (2013). Excerpts on profiles, Appendix. In *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and the social sciences* (4th ed., pp. 121-127, 145-155). New York: Teachers College Press.

## ***Further Reading***

### Introduction and Overview:

Forsey, Martin. (2012). Interviewing individuals. In S. Delamont (Ed.), *Handbook of qualitative research in education* (pp. 364-376). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.

### Reflexivity:

Nairn, Karen, Munro, Jenny, & Smith, Anne B. (2005). A counter-narrative of a "failed" interview. *Qualitative Research*, 5(2), 221-244. doi: 10.1177/1468794105050836

### Theorizing the Interview:

Alvesson, Mats. (2011). *Interpreting interviews*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781446268353>

Archer, Margaret S. (2003). Investigating internal conversations *Structure, agency and the internal conversation* (pp. 153-166). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <example of exploratory interviewing within a critical realist philosophy of science>

Briggs, Charles. (2007). Anthropology, interviewing, and communicability in contemporary society. *Current Anthropology*, 48(4), 551-580.

DeVault, Marjorie L., & McCoy, Liza. (2012). Investigating ruling relations: Dynamics of interviewing in institutional ethnography. In J. F. Gubrium, J. A. Holstein, A. B. Marvasti & K. D. McKinney (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of interview research: The complexity of the craft* (pp. 381-395). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hollway, Wendy & Jefferson, Tony. (2013). Chapter 3: Producing data with defended subjects. In *Doing qualitative research differently: A psychosocial approach* (pp. 24-50). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Porter, Sam. (2002). Critical realist ethnography. In Tim May (Ed.), *Qualitative research in action* (pp. 54-72). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Seidman, Irving. (2013). Chapter 2: A structure for in-depth, phenomenological interviewing. In *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and the social sciences* (4th ed., pp. 14-31). New York: Teachers College Press.

Sims-Schouten, Wendy, Riley, Sarah C. E., & Willig, Carla. (2007). Critical realism in discourse analysis: A presentation of a systematic method of analysis using women's talk of motherhood, childcare, and female employment as an example. *Theory & Psychology* 17(1), 101-124. doi: 10.1177/0959354307073153.

Talmy, Steven. (2010). Qualitative interviews in applied linguistics: From research instrument to social practice. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 30, 128-148. doi: 10.1017/S0267190510000085.

### Doing Interviews: Technical Matters

Reybold, L. Earle, Lammert, Jill D., & Stribling, Stacia M. (2013). Participant selection as a conscious research method: Thinking forward and the deliberation of "emergent" findings. *Qualitative Research*, 13(6), 699-716. doi: 10.1177/1468794112465634.

Robinson, Oliver. (2014). Sampling in interview-based qualitative research: A theoretical and practical guide. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 11(1), 25-41. doi: 10.1080/14780887.2013.801543

Roulston, Kathryn. (2011). Working through challenges in doing interview research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 10(4), 348-366.

Windsong, Elena Ariel. (2016). Incorporating intersectionality into research design: An example using qualitative interviews. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 21(2), 135-147. doi: 10.1080/13645579.2016.1268361

### Group Interviewing:

Currie, Dawn H. & Kelly, Deirdre M. (2012). Group interviews: Understanding shared meaning and meaning-making. In S. Delamont (Ed.), *Handbook of qualitative research in education* (pp. 405-414). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.

Freeman, Melissa. (2006). Nurturing dialogic hermeneutics and the deliberative capacities of communities in focus groups. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 12(1), 81-95. doi: 10.1177/1077800405282797.

Kamberelis, George & Dimitriadis, Greg. (2011). Focus groups: Contingent articulations of pedagogy, politics, and inquiry. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research* (4th ed., pp. 545-561). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

### Question Types and Elicitation Techniques

Pauwels, Luc. (2015). "Participatory" visual research revisited: A critical-constructive assessment of epistemological, methodological and social activist tenets. *Ethnography*, 16(1), 95-117. doi: 10.1177/1466138113505023

### Ethnographic Interviewing:

Frank, Carolyn. (2011). *Ethnographic interviewing for teacher preparation and staff development: A field guide*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Hammersley, Martyn, & Atkinson, Paul. (2007). Oral accounts and the role of interviewing *Ethnography: Principles in practice third edition* (3rd ed., pp. 97-120). New York: Routledge.

#### Ethics:

Corbin, Juliet & Morse, Janice M. (2003). The unstructured interactive interview: Issues of reciprocity and risks when dealing with sensitive topics. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 9(3), 335-354.

Hammersley, Martyn. (2009). Against the ethicists: On the evils of ethical regulation. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 12(3), 211-225. doi: 10.1080/13645570802170288.

Hammersley, Martyn. (2014). On the ethics of interviewing for discourse analysis. *Qualitative Research*, 14(5), 529-541. doi: 10.1177/1468794113495039.

Loveridge, Judith & Cornforth, Sue. (2014). The ages of consent: Re-working consensual frameworks in postmodern times. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 27(4), 454-471. doi: 10.1080/09518398.2013.780316.

#### Positionality and Power Dynamics:

Gawlewicz, Anna. (2016). Language and translation strategies in researching migrant experience of difference from the position of migrant researcher. *Qualitative Research*, 16(1), 27-42. doi: 10.1177/1468794114557992

Hurd Clarke, Laura. (2003). Overcoming ambivalence: The challenges of exploring socially charged issues. *Qualitative Health Research*, 13(5), 718-735. doi: 10.1177/1049732303013005009 < study of older women's body image and embodied experience >

Kvale, Steinar (2006). Dominance through interviews and dialogues. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 12(3), 480-500. doi: 10.1177/1077800406286235.

Merriam, Sharan B., Johnson- Bailey, Juanita, Lee, Ming-Yeh, Kee, Youngwha, Ntseane, Gabo, & Muhamad, Mazanah. (2001). Power and positionality: Negotiating insider/ outsider status within and across cultures. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 20(5), 405-416.

#### Transcription:

Hammersley, Martyn. (2012). Transcription of speech. In S. Delamont (Ed.), *Handbook of qualitative research in education* (pp. 439-445). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.

Henderson, Holly. (2018). Difficult questions of difficult questions: The role of the researcher and transcription styles. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 31(2), 143-157. doi: 10.1080/09518398.2017.1379615

Mishler, Elliot G. (1991). Representing discourse: The rhetoric of transcription. *Journal of Narrative and Life History*, 1(4), 255-280.

Tilley, Susan A. (2003). "Challenging" research practices: Turning a critical lens on the work of transcription. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 9(5), 750-773.

#### Data Analysis:

Bacchi, Carol, & Bonham, Jennifer. (2016). Appendix: Poststructural interview analysis: Politicizing "personhood". In Carol Bacchi & Susan Goodwin (Eds.), *Poststructural policy analysis: A guide to practice* (pp. 113-121). New York: Palgrave MacMillan.

Baker, Carolyn. (1983). A "second look" at interviews with adolescents. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 12(6), 501-519. doi: 10.1007/BF02088667.

Cortazzi, Martin & Lixian, Jin. (2012). Approaching narrative analysis with 19 questions. In S. Delamont (Ed.), *Handbook of qualitative research in education* (pp. 474-488). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.

Frith, Hannah & Kitzinger, Celia. (1998). "Emotion work" as a participant resource: A feminist analysis of young women's talk-in-interaction. *Sociology*, 32(2), 299-320

Rapley, Timothy John. (2001). The art(fulness) of open-ended interviewing: Some considerations on analysing interviews. *Qualitative Research*, 1(3), 303-323. doi: 10.1177/146879410100100303.

Riessman, Catherine Kohler. (2012). Analysis of personal narratives. In J. F. Gubrium, J. A. Holstein, A. B. Marvasti & K. D. McKinney (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of interview research: The complexity of the craft* (pp. 367-379). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

#### Presenting Data, Writing:

Butterwick, Shauna. (2002). Your story, my story, our story: Performing interpretation in participatory theatre. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research* 48(3), 240-253.

Delamont, Sara. (2012). Autobiography: Tales of the writing self. In S. Delamont (Ed.), *Handbook of qualitative research in education* (pp. 542-549). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.

Richardson, Laurel. (2003). Poetic representation of interviews. In J. F. Gubrium & J. A. Holstein (Eds.), *Postmodern interviewing* (pp. 187-201). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Sangha, Jasjit K., Slade, Bonnie, Mirchandani, Kiran, Maitra, Srabani, & Shan, Hongxia. (2012). An ethnodrama on work-related learning in precarious jobs: Racialization and resistance. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 18(3), 286-296. doi: 10.1177/1077800411431555.

Assessing Quality:

Brinkmann, Svend. (2013). Excerpt from chapter 5: Discussion of qualitative interviewing. In *Qualitative Interviewing* (pp. 150-158). Oxford: Oxford University Press, USA.

Tracy, Sarah J. (2010). Qualitative quality: Eight "big-tent" criteria for excellent qualitative research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 16(10), 837-851. doi: 10.1177/1077800410383121.

**©Deirdre M. Kelly. Not to be copied, used, or revised without explicit written permission from the copyright owner.**