

Sociology 537/637
QUALITATIVE DATA ANALYSIS
Fall 2019
Mondays 2:00-4:50
Cramer 265

Dr. Maura Kelly
Email: maura@pdx.edu
Office: Cramer 217 R
Office hours: Mondays 12:00-2:00

COURSE DESCRIPTION

This course will cover the process of analyzing qualitative data. It will include situating a qualitative study within the relevant literature, coding qualitative data with computer software, writing up the findings of qualitative research, and constructing arguments with qualitative data. This course will be a practical, hands-on seminar in which students complete a qualitative data analysis project using their own data from interviews, focus groups, ethnography, participant observation, or texts (students who have not collected data prior to the course will develop a content analysis project).

COURSE REQUIREMENTS

See additional guidelines for assignments attached to the syllabus.

Class preparation and participation (20 points): Come to class prepared to discuss the assigned readings and course assignments. In-class assignments may be used to assess preparation. Participate in the conversation with thoughtful comments and questions. Informally report out to the class on the progress of the research project. Being absent from more than one class will negatively affect the course grade.

Discussion questions (15 points): Write three questions for five of the seven class meetings that discussion questions are assigned. Discussion questions are due by midnight before the day of the class meeting (late discussion questions will not be accepted).

Assignment 1: Research design (5 points): Provide one to three (one is best) research question(s), research method, sample, and sampling strategy for the proposed research project. Assignments may require revision before final approval to go forward with the project (no point penalty if a revision is needed).

Assignment 2: Literature review summary table and outline (5 points): After identifying and skimming 10-20 empirical peer-reviewed articles (scholarly books and book chapters are also acceptable), create a table of the empirical research most similar to your current project. In the same document, provide an outline of the subsections of the lit review (note key references you will discuss in each subsection of the lit review).

Assignment 3: Methods section (5 points): Write up the methods section for your research project (excluding the data analysis subsection). Assignments may require revision before final approval to go forward with the project (no point penalty if a revision is needed).

Assignment 4: Outline of results section (5 points): Organize findings into three to five topics or themes, which will represent the subsections of the results section.

Assignment 5: First draft of one results subsection (10 points): Write the first draft of one of the subsections of the results. This will be **one** of the three to five subsections you previously outlined.

Assignment 6: First full draft the manuscript with abstract, intro, lit review, methods, results, discussion (10 points): Write a first draft of the full manuscript.

Assignment 7: Workshopping the manuscript (5 points): Read and comment on two to three peers' manuscripts. Submit written comments via D2L and participate in the workshop during class.

Assignment 8: Final full draft with abstract, intro, lit review, methods, results, discussion (20 points): Revise the full draft of the manuscript based on feedback from instructor on previous assignments as well as feedback on the full draft from the workshop.

COURSE OUTLINE

Note: All readings must be completed prior to class. Three discussion questions must be submitted for five of the six class meetings with discussion questions assigned. Discussion questions are due by 9:00am on the day of the class meeting (late discussion questions will not be accepted).

Week 1: September 30 Research Question

Reading

- Kelly, Maura. 2019. "Chapter 1: Putting Feminist Research into Practice" and "Chapter 2: Overview of Sociological Research" Pp. 1-19 in *Feminist Research in Practice*. Rowman and Littlefield. D2L **This may be review for some students**
- Welsh, Megan. 2019. "Conceptualizing the Personal Touch: Experiential Knowledge and Gendered Strategies in Community Supervision Work" *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 48(3): 311-338. [LINK](#)
- Gast, Melanie Jones. 2018. "'They Give Teachers a Hard Time': Symbolic Violence and Intersections of Race and Class in Interpretations of Teacher-student Relations" *Sociological Perspectives* 61(2): 257-275. [LINK](#)
- Smith, Linda Tuhiwai. 2012. *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*.

Assignments

- Discussion questions due **Sunday September 29 by midnight** via D2L

Week 2: October 7
Literature Review I

Reading

- Edgell, Penny and Kathleen E. Hull. 2017. "Cultural Schemas of Religion, Science, and Law in Talk About Social Controversies" *Sociological Forum* 32(2): 298-320. [LINK](#)
- Barcelos, Chris. 2018. "Culture, Contraception, and Colorblindness: Youth Sexual Health Promotion as a Gendered Racial Project" *Gender & Society* 32(2): 252-273. [LINK](#)

Assignments

- Discussion questions due **Sunday October 6 by midnight** via D2L
- Assignment 1: Research design assignment due **Sunday October 6 by midnight** via D2L

Week 3: October 14
Literature Review II

Reading

- Identify and skim 10-20 peer-reviewed articles for your lit review
- Optional reading: Earl, Jennifer, Andrew Martin, John D. McCarthy, and Sarah A. Soule. 2004. "The Use of Newspaper Data in the Study of Collective Action" *Annual Review of Sociology* 30: 65-80 [LINK](#) **This reading is recommended for students conducting content analyses of news.**

Assignments

- No discussion questions for this week
- Assignment 1: Research design assignment revision (if required) due **Sunday October 13 by midnight** via D2L
- Assignment 2: Lit review summary table and outline due **Sunday October 13 by midnight** via D2L

Week 4: October 21
Methods Section

Reading

- Milkie, Melissa A, Joanna R. Pepin, and Kathleen E. Denny. 2016. "What Kind of War? 'Mommy Wars' Discourse in U.S. and Canadian News, 1989-2013" *Sociological Inquiry* 86(1): 51-78. [LINK](#)
- Jacobson, Ginger, and Alison E. Adams. 2017. "Understanding Environmental Risk Perceptions: A Case of Contested Illness in South Florida." *Sociological Inquiry* 87(4): 659-684. [LINK](#)

Assignments

- Discussion questions due **Sunday October 20 by midnight** via D2L

Week 5: October 28
Coding Qualitative Data I

Reading

- Deterding, Nicole M. and Mary C. Waters. Online first. "Flexible Coding of In-depth Interviews: A Twenty-first-century Approach" *Sociological Methods and Research*. [LINK](#)
- Thomas, David. 2006. "A General Inductive Approach for Analyzing Qualitative Evaluation Data." *American Journal of Evaluation* 27: 237-246. [LINK](#)
- Read through all your data (i.e. interview transcripts, ethnographic field notes, or texts)

Assignment

- Discussion questions due **Sunday October 27 by midnight** via D2L
- Assignment 3: Methods section assignment **Sunday October 27 by midnight** via D2L
- If you are using Dedoose, watch the instructional videos (introduction, code setup, descriptors, documents, document excerpting, and analysis) available at <https://www.dedoose.com/resources/videos> due **Monday October 28 by 2pm** (to be discussed in class)
- If you are using Atlas.ti, watch the following instructional video <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=EK9yZ0VqZgE>

Week 6: November 4
Coding Qualitative Data II

Reading

- Emerson, Robert M, Rachel I. Fretz, and Linda L. Shaw. 2011. "Chapter 6: Processing Fieldnotes: Coding and Memoing" Pp. 171-199. *Writing Ethnographic Field Notes*, Second Edition. The University of Chicago Press. D2L
- Kidd, Paula and Mark Marshall. 2000. "Getting the Focus and the Group: Enhancing Analytical Rigor in Focus Group Research." *Qualitative Health Research* 10(3): 293-308. [LINK](#)
- Review this comparison of qualitative coding software [LINK](#)

Assignment

- Discussion questions due **Sunday November 3 by midnight** via D2L
- Assignment 3: Methods section assignment revision (if required) due **Sunday November 3 by midnight** via D2L

Week 7: November 11(NO CLASS)

Assignment

- Complete initial coding of all data
- Assignment 4: Outline of results due **Sunday November 10 by midnight** via D2L

- Start working on assignment 5: First draft of one results subsection due **Sunday November 17 by midnight** via D2L
- Start working on assignment 6: First full draft with abstract, intro, lit review, methods, results, discussion due **Wednesday November 27 by midnight** via D2L

Week 8: November 18
Writing the Manuscript

Reading

- Abelson, Miriam J. 2019. Pp 1-7 in *Men in Place: Trans Masculinity, Race, and Sexuality in America*. U of Minnesota Press. D2L
- Gascón, Luis Daniel, and Aaron Roussell. 2019. Pp 1-7 in *The Limits of Community Policing: Civilian Power and Police Accountability in Black and Brown Los Angeles*. NYU Press. D2L
- Risman, Barbara. 2018. Pp 1-6 in *Where the Millennials Will Take Us: A New Generation Wrestles with the Gender Structure*. Oxford. D2L
- Korver-Glenn, Elizabeth. 2018. “Compounding Inequalities: How Racial Stereotypes and Discrimination Accumulate across the Stages of Housing Exchange.” *American Sociological Review* 83 (4): 627-656. [LINK](#)

Assignment

- Discussion questions due **Sunday November 17 by midnight** via D2L
- Assignment 5: First draft of one results subsection due **Sunday November 17 by midnight** via D2L
- Keep working on assignment 6: First full draft with abstract, intro, lit review, methods, results, discussion due **Wednesday November 27 by midnight** via D2L

Week 9: November 25
Making an Argument

Reading

- Abend, Gabriel, Caitlin Petre, and Michael Sauder. 2013. “Styles of Causal Thought: An Empirical Investigation” *American Journal of Sociology* 119 (3): 602-654. [LINK](#) (**note: focus on the discussion of contemporary U.S. sociology, you can skip over the sections on the comparisons to older U.S. sociology and Mexican sociology**)
- Sullivan, Esther. 2017. “Displaced in Place: Manufactured Housing, Mass Eviction, and the Paradox of State Intervention” *American Sociological Review* 82(2): 243-269. [LINK](#)

Assignment

- Discussion questions due **Sunday November 24 by midnight** via D2L
- Assignment 6: First full draft with abstract, intro, lit review, methods, results, discussion due **Wednesday November 27 by midnight** via D2L (submit to D2L assignments AND D2L discussion board for review by peers)

Week 10: December 2
Revising the Manuscript

Reading due

- 2-3 papers of other students (see assignment below)

Assignment due

- Assignment 7: Read the full draft of papers by 2-3 other students in your workshop group, which will be assigned by the instructor. Peer manuscripts will be available on the D2L discussion board on Wednesday November 20 by midnight. Written comments are due **Monday December 2 by 2pm** via D2L assignments; also bring electronic or hard copy of comments to class for the workshop.

Finals week: December 9

Assignment due

- Assignment 8: Final papers due by **Monday December 9 at midnight** via D2L (no assignments accepted after Friday of finals week)

GUIDELINES FOR DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

TASK

Write three questions for five of the seven class meetings that discussion questions are assigned. These questions will be posed to the class for discussion.

Additional guidelines

1. Write DQs in the form of a question
2. Be as concise as possible (you do not need to provide significant background information, commentary, or an answer to your question).
3. DQs should focus on methods rather than only on findings or implications of empirical studies.
4. If applicable, provide a page number to direct our attention to a specific part of the reading
5. Each individual question may focus on one reading or may make comparisons across readings for that week.
6. DQs may include questions to clarify points in the readings (e.g. what did the author mean by X? Is Y a best practice? How can we accomplish Z goal?)
7. If you have question you *really* want answered, make a note to me in your assignment.

Note: I may not be able to include a question from each student each week. This is generally not a reflection on the quality of your work! If I have any feedback on the quality of your work, I will provide that via D2L.

GUIDELINES FOR ASSIGNMENT 1: RESEARCH DESIGN

TASK

Provide one to three (one is best) research question(s), research method, sample, and sampling strategy for the proposed research project. Assignments may require revision before final approval to go forward with the project (no point penalty if a revision is needed).

Students are encouraged to use an existing set of qualitative data for this project, particularly if you have qualitative data already collected for your thesis or dissertation. In order to be appropriate for the course project, you must have a minimum of 5 interviews completed and transcribed (or solid plans to have them by week 5 of the term). Alternately, you may use focus group transcripts, fieldnotes, fieldnotes with formal and informal interviews.

If you do not currently have a qualitative data set at the start of the course, you will need to create one. The suggested project is a content analysis of 40-50 newspaper articles on the topic of your choice. We can discuss an alternate content analysis project.

Crafting a good research question

1. Can be answered with the *method* being utilized
2. Can be answered with the *data* being utilized
3. Appropriate in scope for the proposed research design (i.e. not too broad, not too narrow)
4. Does not make assumptions about what the results will be

COMPONENTS

Interviews/focus groups

- ☐ Research question(s)
- ☐ Method (e.g. in-depth interview, qualitative interview, semi-structured interview, focus groups)
- ☐ Number of interviews or focus groups (and total number of participants, if different)
- ☐ Criteria for participation (e.g. individual characteristics)
- ☐ Sampling strategy: access and recruitment, type of sample (e.g. convenience, purposive, stratified, random, sample is entire population)

News content analysis

- ☐ Research question(s)
- ☐ Method (e.g. qualitative content analysis, discourse analysis)
- ☐ Source of the data (e.g. Major Dailies database, individual newspaper websites)
- ☐ Criteria for inclusion
 - ☐ Date range and justification
 - ☐ Key terms
 - ☐ Other criteria for inclusion, if relevant (e.g. major dailies, specific newspaper(s))
- ☐ Number of cases in population
- ☐ Number of cases in sample (if different)
- ☐ Sampling strategy (e.g. random, stratified, sample is entire population)

EXAMPLES

For your assignment, use bulleted lists (as shown below)

Example from interview study (Lubitow et al 2018)

- ❑ Research question(s): What are the experiences of transgender and gender non-conforming public transit riders in Portland, Oregon?
- ❑ Method: In-depth interviews
- ❑ Number of interviews: 25
- ❑ Criteria for participation: 1) identify as transgender and/or gender nonconforming; 2) regular public transit riders 3) live in Portland, Oregon; 4) over age 18
- ❑ Sampling strategy: Participants were recruited via a flier shared by the researchers through social media and local networks for gender and sexual minorities. This resulted in a convenience sample of volunteers, with priority given to non-white potential participants to increase the diversity of narratives.

Example from a content analysis study (Kelly 2010)

- ❑ Research question(s): How were the welfare reforms of the 1990s covered in television news media?
- ❑ Method: Quantitative and qualitative content analysis
- ❑ Source of the data: Vanderbilt Television Archive.
- ❑ Criteria for inclusion
 - ❑ Date range: 1992 to 2007, Clinton presidential campaign to “present” (at time of writing)
 - ❑ Key terms: welfare
 - ❑ ABC, NBC, CBS
 - ❑ Over two minutes long
- ❑ Number of cases in population: 180
- ❑ Number of cases in sample: 40
- ❑ Sampling strategy: Random

GUIDELINES FOR ASSIGNMENT 2: LITERATURE REVIEW SUMMARY TABLE AND OUTLINE

TASK

After identifying and skimming 10-20 empirical peer-reviewed articles (scholarly books and book chapters are also acceptable), create a table of the empirical research most similar to your current project. In the same document, provide an outline of the subsections of the lit review (note key references you will discuss in each subsection of the lit review).

As you develop the lit review, keep in mind these questions:

- 1) What does the reader need to know for you to set up your project and findings?
- 2) What is the gap in the literature and how does your study fill that gap?

After you write up the findings, circle back to the lit review outline you developed for this assignment and revise as needed so that you are effectively answering these questions.

COMPONENTS

1. Literature review table

- Author(s) and date
- Size and description of sample
- Description of findings (you might want to copy and paste from the abstract)

Feel free to adapt the table to include any useful additional information (e.g. country of study, definition or operationalization of key concept). If using this approach to summarize quantitative research, include the independent variables and key dependent variables.

2. Literature review outline

- Titles for subsections of literature review
- Brief summary of what each subsection will cover with key citations

Each bullet point in your outline should represent about one paragraph (one idea). Include at least one reference for each bullet point.

EXAMPLES

1. Literature review table: voluntary childlessness (Kelly 2009)

Author and Date	Method/data	Sample	Location	Findings (from abstract)
Abma and Martinez (2006)	Survey, National Survey of Family Growth (1982, 1988, 1995, 2002)	Women aged 35-44 (involuntarily, voluntarily, and temporarily childless)	U.S.	We compare these women to those who are involuntarily childless (fecundity impaired) & to those who are temporarily childless (expect children). Voluntary childlessness grew from 1982 (5%) to 1988 (8%), was stable up to 1995 (9%), & fell slightly in 2002 (7%). Voluntarily childless women have the highest income, prior work experience, & lowest religiosity compared to other women. This has been true since 1982, the earliest time point examined.
Campbell (2000)	Qualitative interviews	23 voluntarily childfree, sterilized women	England	Women seeking sterilization have met with resistance from medical professionals as well as friends and family. Voluntarily childfree women are perceived as abnormal and are often the target of negative and critical comment.

2. Literature review outline: When working hard is not enough (Kelly et al 2015)

- Inequality regimes
 - Intro Acker's (1990) gendered organizations and empirical examples of gendered organizations) Harris and Giuffre 2010; Misra, Lundquist, and Templer 2012; Pierce 1995; Roth 2004; Wallace and Kay 2012; Williams et al 2012).
 - Race inequality in work organizations (Shih 2006; Vallas 2003)
 - Acker's (2006) intersectional inequality regimes and empirical examples of inequality regimes (Bryant and Jaworski 2011; Healy, Bradley, and Forson 2011; Whitehead 2013).
- Women and people of color in the trades
 - A small body of literature has examined the experiences of women in construction in the United States (Berik, Bilginsoy, and Williams 2011; Byrd 1999; Denissen 2010a, 2010b; Denissen and Saguy 2014; Duke et al. 2013; Hunte 2012; Moccio 2009; Paap 2006, 2008; Price 2002), Canada (Cohen and Braid 2000), the United Kingdom (Greed 2000; Watts 2007), and Australia (Lingard and Francis 2004). A few studies have also examined the experiences of racial/ethnic minority men in construction in the United States (Berik et al. 2011; Paap 2006, 2008; Price 2002; Waldinger and Bailey 1991).
 - Harassment (Denissen 2010)
 - Discrimination (Price 2002)
 - Mentorship (Paap 2008)

GUIDELINES FOR ASSIGNMENT 3: METHODS SECTION

TASK

Write up the methods section for your research project (excluding the data analysis subsection). The methods section should be about 600-900 words.

COMPONENTS FOR CONTENT ANALYSIS

Data collection

- ❑ State the research method (e.g. qualitative content analysis, discourse analysis)
- ❑ Source of the data (e.g. Lexis Nexus, individual newspaper websites)
- ❑ Criteria for inclusion: date range, key terms or topic, other criteria for inclusion (e.g. specific newspapers)
- ❑ Sampling strategy (e.g. random, stratified, sample is entire population)
- ❑ Number of cases in population and number of cases in sample.

Describe sample

- ❑ Provide any relevant descriptive information about the sample

Appendix

- ❑ List the cases

COMPONENTS FOR INTERVIEWS OR FOCUS GROUPS

Data collection

- ❑ State research method (e.g. qualitative interviews, in-depth interviews, focus groups)
- ❑ Criteria for participation (e.g. individual characteristics)
- ❑ Access and recruitment
- ❑ Sampling strategy: how sample was chosen from population of all people meeting criteria; state if it is convenience, purposive, random
- ❑ Number of interviews or focus groups
- ❑ Interview questions: topics addressed and/or examples of questions
- ❑ Interview details: month/year interviews conducted, geographic location, type of space where interviews were conducted, average length or range
- ❑ State interviews were audiotaped and transcribed, pseudonyms used
- ❑ Relevant identities of the researcher and how these identities shaped data collection and analysis
- ❑ State that you are using pseudonyms for individuals and for identifiable locations

Describe sample

- ❑ Demographics and other individual characteristics relevant for the analysis

COMPONENTS FOR ETHNOGRAPHY OR PARTICIPANT OBSERVATION

Describe site

- ❑ Explicitly state research method (e.g. ethnography, participant observation)
- ❑ Describe the site
- ❑ Criteria/explanation for choosing the site (specifically in relation to the research question)
- ❑ How the researcher entered the site (including gaining permission from gatekeepers if relevant)
- ❑ Time in the setting (date range, number of visits, and/or number of hours)
- ❑ Numbers and types of people in the site (approximate)

Data collection

- ❑ What kind of data was collected (e.g. conversations, behavior)
- ❑ How the researcher took jottings/notes in the setting (if at all) and after leaving
- ❑ State that you are using pseudonyms for individuals and/or locations
- ❑ The degree the researcher was a participant in the setting
- ❑ The relevant identities of the researcher and how these identities shaped data collection and analysis

EXAMPLES

Review examples of empirical articles from the reading list on the syllabus and/or empirical articles you identified in your literature review.

GUIDELINES FOR ASSIGNMENT 4: OUTLINE OF RESULTS

TASK

Organize findings into three to five themes or topics, which will represent the subsections of the results section.

COMPONENTS

- 3-5 subsections of the results section (with descriptive headings)
- A short (1-2 sentence) description of the theme or topic of each subsection
- About 10 quotes and/or examples from your data (total across all subsections)

EXAMPLE

Example from research on virginity loss on teen dramas (Kelly 2009)

The Abstinence Script

- Description: The abstinence script indicated a specific meaning of virginity (virginity as a gift) and suggested appropriate action (the social control of teenage sexuality in which sexual behavior is delayed and risk is controlled). Virginity-loss narratives following the abstinence script were characterized by the following themes: (a) virginity as a gift; (b) the pleasures of virginity and the positive consequences for maintaining virginity (often, but not always, until marriage); and (c) the physical, mental, and social dangers of sex and the negative consequences of premarital sex.
- “What happened to sex just being magical and being just being an amazing expression of how much you love someone?...I gave you my heart, that’s all I can give to you, and if that’s not enough for you, then I’m not enough for you” (*One Tree Hill* Episode 21).
- The virginity-loss storylines of Joan and Adam (Joan of Arcadia) and Nathan and Haley (One Tree Hill) portrayed males who agreed to wait because their female partners were not ready for sex.
- “I wish I would have waited. Look past the moment. If you are not ready, then just wait” (One Tree Hill Episode 19).
- Simon’s pregnancy and STI scares (7th Heaven)

The Management Script

- Description: The management script suggested teenage sexual activity was inevitable, if not entirely desirable. It focused on managing the physical, social, and emotional risk associated with virginity loss, most notably through the promotion of contraception. Virginity-loss narratives following the management script employed the following set of themes: (a) virginity loss as a rite of passage, (b) emphasis on “appropriate” virginity loss (e.g., the teenager is at least 16, is in a monogamous romantic relationship, uses contraception, and

discusses sex with an adult), and (c) positive consequences when sex is “appropriate” and negative consequences when sex is “inappropriate.”

- “...It’s not going to be romantic. I mean, it might be and it could be, but if you build it up in your mind as this big thing that’s going to change your life forever, you’re just going to be disappointed. Trust me, the lower your expectations are, the better” (Everwood, Episode 37).
- Positive outcomes of “appropriate” sex: Bradin on Summerland and Amy on Everwood
- Negative outcomes of “inappropriate” sex: “He’s not your Dean. He’s Lindsay’s Dean. You’re the other woman. ... He was cheating, Rory. He was cheating, and you were cheating with him. There’s no other way to spin that, kid” (Gilmore Girls, Episode 87).

The Urgency Script

- Description: The urgency script portrayed virginity loss as not only a highly enjoyable activity but as necessary to affirm a gendered identity as a sexually sought-after individual, to be perceived by others as desirable, and to achieve social status. Narratives employing the urgency script were characterized by the following themes: (a) stigma of virginity, (b) deception about sexual history and desperation to have sex, and (c) positive consequences and increased status for successful virginity loss and negative consequences for unsuccessful virginity-loss attempts in the form of failed performances of masculinity.
- Stigma of virginity: Bradin (Summerland), Ephram (Everwood), Dino, Jonathan, and Ben (Life as We Know It) Summer (The O.C.), Amy (Everwood), and Jackie (Life as We Know It).
- “I don’t know. I guess I felt like I had this reputation to uphold and I figured you’d think less of me or something [if you knew I was a virgin]” (The O.C., Episode 19).
- Counterexample (used for humor): Deborah was sexually experienced and Jonathan did not want to have sex (Life as We Know it)
- “I’ve only kinda sorta been with one girl. It didn’t go very well. She told me I could do ‘everything but,’ right, but I couldn’t find everything, or well, anything, really. It’s not like the drawings on the chalkboard or even the pictures in the magazines. So she just laughed ... and left” (Life as We Know It, Episode 1).

GUIDELINES FOR ASSIGNMENT 5: DRAFT ONE RESULTS SUBSECTION

TASK

Write the first draft of one of the results subsection. This will be one of the three to five subsections you previously outlined. The results section should be about 3000-3600 words overall; one subsection may be about 800 words (depending on how many subsections you have).

COMPONENTS

Findings sections primarily consist of (1) statements about research findings; (2) support for from the data; (3) a discussion of the data. All potential the elements that might be included in a findings section are described below.

- Finding: Statement of research finding, based on more than one participant/observation
- Data: Quote/paraphrase/observation or summary of used to illustrate a finding
- Discuss: Summary, discussion, or close reading of one quote/paraphrase/description (or comparison of multiple)
- Theory: Connection of findings to theory
- Literature: Connection of finding to previous research
- Argument: Explanation of data (e.g. comparison, causal relationship)

After editing your quote, determine if you have a short or long quote (long is generally defined as four lines or more). A long quote is also sometimes called a “block quote.”

Formatting quotes:

Short quotes: in text (double spaced), with quotation marks

Long quotes: indented from left (not both sides), single spaced, no quotation marks

Both short and long quotes must be introduced in the text. For news content analysis, make sure it is clear in this introduction if the quote is from the journalist or a source. Options for citing news include: News source and month/day/year; Author (journalist) last name and year (if a single author has more than one article: Author 2018a, Author 2018b)

EXAMPLES

Below are two examples of a paragraphs from findings sections. Note the use and formatting of short and long quotes. If you prefer to use double spacing, the formatting is the same (except that long quotes remain single spaced).

News content analysis (Kelly 2010)

The most common examples of “system abuse” involved welfare recipients who were portrayed as angry and/or defiantly stated that they did not want to work. For example, a journalist described one white welfare recipient in the following manner:

Dellamarie Morrison is in no mood to swap her welfare check for a paycheck... But under Massachusetts' new law, Dellamarie Morrison, who has lived on welfare for most of the past 18 years, is going to have to change her behavior, if not her attitude. The state wants her off welfare and into a job (ABC 2/12/95).

The one reference to the explicit welfare abuse was made in 1992 by then-President George H.W. Bush: "Some recipients shop from state to state looking for the highest payments. We shouldn't encourage that practice. Our system should not encourage that practice. States should be able to say 'You come here, you get a fair deal, not a free bonus'" (CBS 7/31/92). In the profiles of welfare recipients, there were no examples of women who committed welfare fraud, "shopped around" for higher benefits, or purposefully had more children while on welfare to get more money. Overall there was little discussion of recipients overtly "abusing" the system.

Interviews (Savoia and Kelly in progress)

For our participants, recognition as non-binary was difficult to achieve because of the pervasiveness of binary understandings of gender; they were regularly misrecognized as men or women. West noted that they were generally perceived by others as "Probably cisgender female, maybe like tomboy, but female at first glance." When asked how this misrecognition made them feel, West said:

Sometimes it's kind of invalidating because it shouldn't matter what you look like. But people really like black and white and not a lot of people want to think about non-binary gender identities. So it kind of makes me feel like I need to be more masculine, get a shorter haircut, stuff like that. [If I had short hair], it would just make me feel more, it would make me seem more valid, my identity more valid, and less explaining to do, like "you look the part, you're okay," kind of thing.

Our participants rarely achieved consistent recognition as non-binary, which caused varying levels of discomfort. These narratives have similarities to Garrison's (2018) non-binary transgender participants who struggled with (and resisted) narratives about what it means to be "trans enough" to be recognized as transgender.

GUIDELINES FOR ASSIGNMENTS 6 AND 8: WRITING THE MANUSCRIPT

TASK

Write the full manuscript, about 7000 to 9000 words.

COMPONENTS

Abstract

- ❑ 150-200 words
- ❑ Summary of theory, methods, and key results

Introduction

- ❑ 300-1500 words (approximately 1-5 double spaced pages)
- ❑ Start with a hook: a puzzle, a representative example from your findings, etc
- ❑ Introduction to topic/population
- ❑ Research question(s) and outline of argument
- ❑ State method and data (e.g. X interviews, X months in the field site).
- ❑ Optional: introduction of key theoretical concepts and/or key empirical results from previous scholarship

Literature review

- ❑ 1200-1800 words (approximately 4-6 double spaced pages)
- ❑ Discussion of the theory and empirical literature related to your study
- ❑ Identify what is already known and what gap your study is filling

Methods

- ❑ 600-900 words (approximately 2-3 double spaced pages)
- ❑ Data collection: Necessary elements depend on method (see guidelines for methods section assignment)
- ❑ Describe sample and/or site: Necessary elements depend on method (see guidelines for methods section assignment)
- ❑ Data analysis
 - ❑ Approach to data analysis (e.g. inductive, drawing on previous research and/or theory)
 - ❑ Description of the analysis process
 - ❑ Description of codes or themes

Results

- ❑ 3000-3600 words (approximately 10-12 double spaced pages)
- ❑ include 3-5 subsections (use subheadings).
- ❑ Use of descriptive examples (and counter-examples) from your data, analysis of examples
- ❑ Cohesive argument that answers the research question

Discussion

- ❑ 600-900 words (approximately 2-3 double spaced pages)
- ❑ Brief summary of results and overall argument
- ❑ Implications of results for theory, policy, activism, and/or future research

References

- ❑ List all sources cited in the text

Appendix

- ❑ List of cases (content analysis only)

ASSIGNMENT 7: WORKSHOPPING THE MANUSCRIPT

TASK

Read two to three peers' manuscripts and provide feedback in narrative form (1000-1200 words). Submit your assignment to me via D2L assignments, share your written feedback with your peers via D2L discussion board, and participate in the workshop during class.

COMPONENTS

You will offer comments similar to the approach used in peer review. In narrative form answer the questions below for each manuscript you are assigned (do not offer comments in bullet for or in track changes).

1. Title of paper and author name?
2. What is this paper about? State the overall argument in your own words
3. What are the current strengths of the paper?
4. How can the introduction be improved? Does the introduction appropriately set up the paper?
5. How can the literature review be improved? (substantive knowledge of the area not required here). Does the literature review make explicit what is known and what gap the current paper fills?
6. How can the methods section be improved? Does the methods section provide all the necessary information about the research design?
7. How can the results section be improved? Does the results section offer a well-organized and cohesive argument that answers the research question? Is the data used effectively to make this argument?
8. How can the discussion be improved? Does the discussion go beyond summarizing to discuss implications for theory, policy, activism, and/or future research?
9. What else can the author do to improve the paper?
10. Does the paper include ALL the necessary components (see guidelines for assignments 6 and 8)? If not, what is missing? Be specific.

The purpose of the peer workshop is to provide substantive feedback, NOT to edit or proofread the manuscript. If there are issues with readability, spelling, or grammar in the paper, make one note to the author to carefully edit and proofread prior to submitting the final draft.

EXAMPLE

“BB See: Transparency Legislation and Public Discussions of Wage Inequality” by [author] asks how media coverage of gender pay inequities shifted with the release of BBC pay data. The issue of pay secrecy is an important one and the authors have chosen interesting data (coverage of the issue from three British newspapers) to explore this issue. The author’s writing is clear and concise, which made it easy to follow their thought process. Overall, this is a nicely conceptualized and

executed content analysis project! This paper would be improved with some revision to the front end and conclusion (especially to clarify what can and cannot be claimed by the data) as well as potentially reorganizing the findings. I provide some comments I hope are helpful for revision.

In the front end, the author does a nice job of describing previous literature on pay secrecy and articulates this impact on gender wage gaps within organizations. Here it might be useful to briefly address that the overall gender wage gap has multiple causes. The instances of women being paid less than men for doing the same job is only one of the causes contributing to overall gender wage gaps (and this is not what explains most of the gender wage gap). We hear about occupational segregation for the first time in the methods section, this (and other relevant wage gap factors) should be in the front end.

In the front end, the author raises the point in a few places that discovery of pay inequalities may be problematic/delegitimizing for organizations. This seems to suggest that the data might include a case study about what happened with legitimacy at the BBC. But that is clearly outside the scope of the data and the analysis. I would clarify this in the front end to redirect the focus towards the main points of the paper.

Overall, the front end could be revised to more clearly articulate how the author views the role of news media in society and what content analysis of news media can accomplish. The author writes “How the media presents an issue both reflects and forms societal thoughts.” Indeed. However, content analysis is only able to tell us what societal messages the media is reflecting, not the impact on audiences. That ought to be explicit here. Also, certainly media coverage is one part of (and one way to operationalize) “public discourse.” But be careful of completely conflating these two.

With content analysis, it can be hard not to slip into arguments or claims that go beyond the data. Here, the author goes beyond their data in several places in the paper. For example, in the abstract, the author states “Drawing on media reports about gender pay differentials, we consider whether pay transparency can also shift broader public discourse.” It would be more accurate to say “Drawing on media reports about gender pay differentials, we consider whether a public disclosure of pay transparency can also shift broader public discourse, as represented by news media coverage of this issue.” In the abstract, they also say “The findings suggest that wage transparency coupled with media attention may not only empower individual workers and their agents to recognize and address inequitable pay in firms, but also work more broadly to create space to discuss discriminatory practices and redress for pay disparities.” The authors do not have the data to say whether or not individuals may be empowered by media attention to this issue.

It seems reasonable to me to speculate (ideally in the conclusion, probably not in the abstract or front end), about what impacts this news coverage might have on audiences. However, it should be clear that these are speculations (helpfully supported by previous research) not findings from the data of the current study.

The author did a nice job of describing the research design in the methods section. All choices are articulated and well-justified. This study could certainly be replicated with the level of detail provided here.

I found the three themes (personal responsibility, discrimination, organizations) an effective way to think about the findings. However, the organization of the findings section could be improved. The author starts the findings with sections on personal responsibility and discrimination, but then surprisingly does not present the organizations theme. Given that the main argument of the paper is about how the prevalence of themes shifted over three time periods, I would like to see that discussed a bit more in the first two findings sections.

The next few findings sections turn to focus on the third time period (without first presenting sections on the first two time periods). The findings end with a section of the organizations theme across all time periods. I suggest that the findings be organized either thematically or chronologically, not a mix of both. Given that the main argument is about change over time, I would lean towards organizing the findings chronologically. Although I also could see this working if it were organized thematically (as long as there is discussion of change across time periods in the discussions of each of the themes)

This main argument is clearly supported by the data presented in Table 1. My suggestions here are cosmetic. For this table, having both the N and the % makes the table harder to read. Consider converting this to a stacked column figure (that visually shows the % of each theme across the three time periods visually and perhaps states the Ns).

I do wonder if there's something more to say about co-occurrence of these themes. I don't suggest further quantitative analysis with a relatively small N. But is can you say anything with your qualitative data about what happens when multiple themes are presented in the same article. Are there examples of co-occurrence where one explanation is privileged over others? Did that change over the three time periods? There seems to be a bit of this spread across the findings, but more explicit attention might be useful. For example, the author notes that some articles rejected some explanations in favor of others (e.g. examples of journalists rejecting discrimination as an explanation). As a methodological point, were those examples tallied as examples of the discrimination theme or no? Clarify this in the methods section.

In the conclusion, the author does a nice job of summarizing the findings and circling back to discuss why pay disclosure is important. There is again some slippage here in what the data from this study can show and the arguments the author would like to make. Careful editing to stay within the bounds of the data of the current study (or supporting arguments with evidence from previous studies) is needed. Ultimately, I'm left convinced that this is an important topic and this study has a useful contribution to make to the literature.

APPROPRIATE CITATIONS AND PLAGARISM

Citing sources in this course

When you draw ideas from someone else, you need to cite the source in the text and provide a references section. For this course, appropriate citations are essential, but any style of citation is acceptable. Note that readings listed in the syllabus and the examples below use the American Sociological Association (ASA) style. More on ASA style here [LINK](#).

Defining plagiarism

According to the MLA Handbook, plagiarism is “using another person’s ideas, information or expressions without acknowledging that person’s work.”

How to avoid plagiarizing:

Rule #1: If you use another person’s ideas, you must cite your source in the text (author last name and year);

Rule #2: If you use another person’s exact words, you must put those words in quotation marks as well as cite your source in the text (author last name, year, and page number)

Examples of appropriate citations and plagiarism

Text from original source

- *Karen’s transgressive campiness is also manifest in her flagrant sexuality.*

Appropriate citations

- *Karen’s sexuality is transgressive and campy (Cooper 2003)*
- *The character of Karen shows “transgressive campiness” (Cooper 2003:519).*
- *Cooper stated, “Karen’s transgressive campiness is also manifest in her flagrant sexuality” (2003:519).*

Plagiarism

- *Karen’s transgressive campiness is also manifest in her flagrant sexuality.* [copy and paste, no quotation marks, no citation]
- *Karen’s transgressive campiness is shown in her flagrant sexuality.* [almost identical language, no citation]

POLICIES

Required Readings: Links to the required readings available through the PSU library are included in the syllabus. If you cannot access a reading through the link, you are responsible for navigating to the reading from the PSU library homepage.

Required software: You will be required to access either Atlas.ti (available on PSU computers) or Dedoose (available for purchase for your own computer at \$10.95 per month at

www.dedoose.com). Dedoose will be used in class but either program can be used for the course project.

D2L: The syllabus and other course materials will be posted on D2L. All assignments will be submitted via D2L (no hard copies). Points earned and written feedback for all assignments will be posted on D2L.

Email: I will regularly communicate with students individually and as a class via email. My emails will be sent to your PSU email. It is your responsibility to check your PSU email daily during the school week and respond in a timely manner. In emails to me, please put the title of the course in the subject line and sign your emails using your first and last name. Use the email address on the first page of the syllabus. I will generally respond to email within 24 hours. Emails sent after 5:00pm on Friday will generally be answered by 5:00pm on Monday.

Late Assignments: Assignments will be marked down 10% per day late and will not be accepted after seven days. Final papers will not be accepted after 5:00pm of finals week.

Academic honesty: You are expected to demonstrate complete academic honesty. Please refer to the Student Conduct Code for more detailed information on PSU policies. Cheating or plagiarizing will result in failing the assignment and will be reported. If you use a direct quote (i.e. someone else's written or spoken words), you must include it in quotation marks. Any time you take a direct quote, as well as when you summarize or paraphrase an idea from another person, you must cite the source and include a references section at the end of the paper. Failure to cite your sources, whether intentional or not, is plagiarism. Instances of plagiarism will result in failing the assignment, and possibly the course, and will be reported.

Access and inclusion for students with disabilities: If any aspects of instruction or course design result in barriers to your inclusion or learning, please notify me. The Disability Resource Center (DRC) provides reasonable accommodations for students who encounter barriers in the learning environment. If you have, or think you may have, a disability that may affect your work in this class and feel you need accommodations, contact the DRC to schedule an appointment and initiate a conversation about reasonable accommodations. The DRC is located in 116 Smith Memorial Student Union, 503-725-4150, drc@pdx.edu, <http://www.pdx.edu/drc>. If you already have accommodations, please contact me to make sure that I have received a faculty notification letter and to discuss your accommodations.

Title IX reporting: As a member of the university community, I have the responsibility to report any instances of sexual harassment, sexual violence and/or other forms of prohibited discrimination. If you would rather share information about sexual harassment, sexual violence or discrimination to a confidential employee who does not have this reporting responsibility, you can find a list of those individuals at <http://www.pdx.edu/sexual-assault/get-help> or you may call a confidential IPV Advocate at 503-725-5672.