DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 368 768   TM 021 190

AUTHOR   Newman, Isadore; And Others
TITLE   Qualitative Analysis of Comic Strip Culture: A
              Methodological Inquiry.
PUB DATE   Feb 94
NOTE   27p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the
              Eastern Educational Research Association (17th,
              Sarasota, FL, February 9-12, 1994).
PUB TYPE   Reports - Research/Technical (143) --
              Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE   MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS   Classification; *Comics (Publications); Context
              Effect; Data Analysis; Evaluation Methods; *Graduate
              Students; Groups; Individual Characteristics;
              *Popular Culture; *Qualitative Research; *Research
              Methodology; Training
IDENTIFIERS   *Grounded Theory; Research Replication

ABSTRACT
        The paper is a methodological inquiry into the
interpretation of qualitative data. It explores a grounded-theory
approach to the synthesis of data and examines, in particular, the
construction of categories. It focuses on ways of organizing and
attaching meaning to data, as research problems embedded in a
cultural context are explored. A qualitative research training task
with 4-5 graduate students per group (4 or 5 groups per class)
evaluating comic strip culture, was used to show how different ways
of categorizing data lead to different interpretations of comic strip
culture. Consistency within groups and how groups differ were
studied. Implications of this study center around the idiosyncratic
nature of qualitative research, the issues related to
generalizability, and the relationships between training and
nontraining of researchers to the interpretation of data. The results
of this investigation reflect the systematic replication of three
independent studies with 27, 23, and 22 individual responses.
Includes five tables. (Contains 16 references.) (Author/SLD)

QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS OF COMIC STRIP CULTURE:

A METHODOLOGICAL INQUIRY

Isadore Newman
Suzanne MacDonald
Brad Potts

University of Akron

2

QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS OF COMIC STRIP CULTURE: A METHODOLOGICAL INQUIRY[1]

Isadore Newman
Suzanne MacDonald
Brad Potts

University of Akron

ABSTRACT

The paper is a methodological inquiry into the interpretation of qualitative data. It explores a grounded theory approach to the synthesis of data, and examines, in particular, construction of categories. It focuses on ways of organizing data and attaching meaning, as research problems embedded in cultural context are explored. A qualitative research tr. ning task, with 4-5 subjects per group (4 or 5 groups per class) evaluating comic strip culture, was used. We wanted to know how different ways of categorizing data lead to different interpretations of comic strip culture. In this regard we were looking at a) consistency within groups, and b) how groups differ. Implications of this study center around the idiosyncratic nature of qualitative research, issues related to generalizability, and relationships between training and non-training of researchers to the interpretation of data. The results of this investigation reflect the systematic replication of three independent studies.

Perspective

Qualitative research has gained in popularity but with few people well-trained in the methodology applying to its use. With the increase in usage there is also an increase in the need to understand some of the concerns innate in the procedures used when conducting qualitative investigations. It is recognized by almost all authorities (Eisner & Peshkin, 1990; Guba & Lincoln, 1982; Howe & Eisenhart, 1990; LeCompte & Goetz, 1982) that qualitative research has a high subjective component in its interpretation and that this has been a major criticism leveled at this particular approach. The current research project, addressing this concern, has attempted to peel back the "veneers of phenomenological representation" (Constas, 1992, p. 254) to examine the process of category development which is often only implicitly recognized.

The rebuttal to the criticism of subjectivity in qualitative research tends to rest on 1) strengths of the methodology which compensate for the subjectivity inherent to some extent in the method, and 2) the assumption that training in coding methodology and other aspects of qualitative procedures will decrease these concerns. Based upon the second argument above, the investigators designed a methodological inquiry examining the elicitation of categories as part of a qualitative interpretation of a cartoon culture. Investigators were particularly interested in the effects of coding training on the elicitation of categories.

As a methodological inquiry into the interpretation of qualitative data, these studies explore a grounded theory approach to the synthesis of data, i.e., generation of theory through the discovery of categories elicited from data (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). We are looking at the identification and building of categories as one part of the coding, categorizing, and thematic development sequence. Looking at research problems as embedded in cultural context, our concern here is in the organization and attachment of meaning to data.

This research addresses some key components of an ongoing debate over the value and place of qualitative approaches to the understanding of problems in education and related fields. We see ourselves as dealing with "questions concerning the credibility and status of qualitative inquiry ... (and) the privatization of qualitative analysis" (Constas, 1992, p. 265). Eisner and Peshkin (1990) stress the need to explore and further develop models of qualitative research acceptable to the research community, and to which educational researchers might turn for direction. Newman and Benz (1992) ask that educational researchers reject the qualitative-quantitative dichotomy and think in terms of a synthesis of the two approaches. These perspectives involve, among other things, renewed examination of both research approaches in

terms of a broader paradigm or frame of reference than has often been used in the past.

These studies focus on the data analysis phase of ethnographic research. The importance of the investigation is related to the tremendous complexity and layering of ethnographic interpretation. It is Geertz who observed ". . . that what we call our data are really our own constructions of other people's constructions of what they and their compatriots are up to . . . (and that it) is obscured because most of what we need to comprehend a particular event, ritual, custom, idea, or whatever is insinuated as background information before the thing itself is directly examined (1973, p. 9)."

This particular research focuses on qualitative inquiry in relation to issues of reliability, validity, and generalization--concerns often raised by educational researchers, especially by "quantitative" researchers (Kirk & Miller, 1986). Addressing its inappropriateness for generalization, the value of qualitative research is often described as in the depth and richness of description it provides in particular and idiosyncratic cases, and not in generalization to other cases (Erickson, 1988; Peshkin, 1993). However, there are some recent claims by qualitative researchers such as Polkinghorne (1991) and Firestone (1993) that qualitative research can be generalized, in some ways, beyond the specific case. By looking at the elicitation of categories as part of the process of qualitative analysis, this research focuses on the above concerns.

Objectives

This is an investigation of the qualitative interpretation of a synthetic cartoon culture, controlling for methodological concerns. The different stages in the investigation will be referred to as Study 1 (Newman & MacDonald, 1993), Study 2 (MacDonald, Newman, Waite, & Potts, 1993), and Study 3 (which is not

reported anywhere except here). The investigation described here is a synthesis of the three studies, each study having been built upon an earlier one for purposes of controlling for coding effects and content differences. The investigation also has the strength of replication, since parts of each of the three studies were virtually identical, allowing us to estimate the effects of sample differences.

Specifically, the purpose of the investigation was to examine some methodological aspects of qualitative data analysis. The objectives of the investigation are as follows:

1) To replicate findings of previous studies

2) To estimate the effect of training subjects in coding techniques on change in their interpretation

3) To estimate the effect of training subjects in coding techniques towards increasing group consensus (within-group agreement)

4) To estimte the effect of training subjects in coding techniques towards increasing generalizability across groups (across-group agreement)

5) To estimate agreement between subjects for the identified categories

6) To estimate the effect of content differences within and across groups

Method and Data Source

A comic strip culture was used as a common data set for studying the elicitation of categories in qualitative analysis by 1) individuals given the same data, and 2) groups consisting of the individuals who had already processed the data individually. Comparisons were made of 1) individual responses , 2) intra-group responses, and 3) inter-group responses. A qualitative research training task, with 4-5 member groups evaluating comic strip culture, was used. We wanted to know how different ways of categorizing data lead to different interpretations of comic strip culture. In this regard we were looking at

percentages of agreement, i.e., a) consistency within groups, and b) how groups differ.

We started with four graduate students who served as interviewees after reading comic strip material to be used with a graduate class later. Questions and approach to the cartoon culture simulation were modified on the basis of what we learned. In Week 9 of the semester, twenty-seven students in a graduate course focusing on education in cultural context, participated in a qualitative inquiry into the nature of culture and its analysis through a simulation using ethnographic techniques. In this initial inquiry, Study 1 (Newman and MacDonald, 1993), students doing the analysis had not been trained in ethnographic techniques. They had, however, been exposed over several sessions to characteristics of culture, and a range of concepts associated with culture and sub-cultures. In Study 2 (MacDonald, Newman, Waite, and Potts) and Study 3 students received some training in qualitative data gathering and analysis (see pages 6 and 12).

The class activity was titled MAKING MEANING: AN EXPLORATION OF COMIC STRIP CULTURE , and resulted, in each of the three studies, in 27, 23, and 22 individual responses respectively, and 4-5 group responses, to the following set of questions: 1) Who are the main characters (in this culture)? 2) Which characters have the most prestige (in this culture)? Why do you think this? *3) Describe this culture. What are the cultural values? 4) What general reaction and/or miscellaneous observations can you note? 5) How familiar are you with this comic strip? 6) How long did it take you to read the book? This paper focuses on students' responses to Question #3.

The task consisted of students individually reading the comic strip book and writing their responses to the above questions outside class. Afterwards, during one class session, approximately an hour and a half, the individual

responses were discussed in groups. Each group was asked to reach consensus on a cultural description of this comic strip, following the set of questions they had worked through individually. They were asked to put their group response in writing.

Grouping, for purposes of this in-class activity, was by self-selection. In order to make the task more fun, students were assigned to groups of 4-5, on a first-come, first-serve basis, by raising their hands as they agreed with particular, casual statemer s (in the second and third studies, students "numbered off"). Class discussion followed the group process, including inquiry into change in their thinking as a result of attempting group consensus, i.e., group description of the culture.

The task for Study 1 (Newman & MacDonald, 1993), conducted Spring 1993, remained the same for Study 2 (MacDonald et al., 1993), conducted Summer 1993, and for Study 3, Fall 1993, making Studies 2 and 3 a replication of Study 1, with the addition of some training in coding techniques. Basically, the training in Studies 2 and 3 involved repeated viewings of a video of a culture which was unfamiliar to students in the class; it involved instructing and coaching them in observation, note-taking, and concept development and categorization (Spradley, 1979).

Study 2 is in two parts, Part I being equivalent to the first study where students were asked simply to describe the culture in the first third of the book, without reliance on any specific training. In Part II they were asked to apply their coding training to interpretation of the culture as depicted in either the second or third section of the book.

Study 3 also had two parts. Part I of Study 3 was a replication of Study 2. In conducting these studies, students were assigned various portions of the text for different parts of the assignment. Study 1; Study 2, Part I; and Study 3, Part I

are all based on the first third of the text. Study 2, Part II and Study 3, Part II are based on the remaining two-thirds of the text. In Study 3 the students arrived at separate group consensus for the first and second part of the assignment. A split in group consensus along content lines (different parts of the text--first, second, third--had different content) allowed for creation of the second part of the study, which will compare effects of coding training with consensus arrived at in the latter part of the text. We are comparing coding differences based on overall consensus with coding differences based on content-specific differences. Part II of Study 3, then, used the same procedures as in the previous part, but also examined content differences.

Analysis

Students' written responses to Question #3 (above) were categorized and tallied in three ways. First, individual answers were written before the group session in class. We used those individual responses to develop categories describing the culture. Secondly, we tallied the number of individuals who identified similar categories. Third, we had the group respond-- come to some consensus[2]--and tallied the group responses by categories generated. Then we compared the number of categories generated and the agreement of individuals compared to group agreement with the categories. In each of the three ways of framing the data above, we have looked at differences due to coding effects and content variation. The results from Study 1 are reported in Table 1. The results from Study 2, Parts I and II, are shown in Tables 2 and 3 respectively. Results from Study 3, Parts I and II, are reported in Tables 4 and 5 respectively.

---

[2]We have operationally defined **consensus** to mean *whatever the group agreed upon.*

Results of Study 1 (Without training)

Findings for Study 1 were: 1) Intra-group differences and perceptions were pronounced. Out of 19 possible categories, there was no group in which <u>everyone</u> selected any one category, although in some cases attention clustered in certain categories, 2) Group consensus varied considerably from individual reports, 3) Individuals reported more diverse answers than group consensus indicated, in spite of the fact that most individuals reported no change in atttitudes as a result of the experience, 4) Group consensus provided responses which were more simplified, and were focused on fewer categories than those of individuals, and 5) Unexpectedly, inter-group comparisons based on consensus yielded little agreement.

Results of Study 2 (With training)

Study 2 produced slightly different categories than Study 1 (See Tables 1, 2, and 3). For the class in Study 2, Part II (the part that used their training in developing the categories), more categories (29 versus 34), and more values within categories, were identified, implying that training may have increased students' awareness and ability to discern increased numbers of categories and variations within categories.

As one can see from Table 2, Study 2, Part I, this class, when given the same task as those in Study 1, produced results which were not any more consistent than those in Study 1; there was still a wide range of differences in categories within and between groups. For instance, in Study 2, Part I, Group 3 elicited only 13 out of the possible total of 29 categories generated by the class, whereas Group 4 came up with 23 of the 29 categories. Looking at the consensus items for Study 2, Part I, i.e., how many categories individuals identified compared with categories that the group agreed upon as existing, we found the following percentages of agreement for the five groups: 35%, 22%,

54%, 30%, and 28%. The averages of the percentages were about the same as in Study 1 (19%, 33%, and 50%)[3].

Table 3 summarizes the data that was collected from students in Study 2, Part II, where they were asked to apply their training in coding to the interpretation of the cartoon culture. As one can see from Table 3, there were more categories produced here than in Study 1 or in Part I of Study 2. However, the percentages of agreement between the individual responses in the group and the consensus items for the group were less than those in Study 1 or in Part I of Study 2. The percentages for Study 2, Part II were: 29%, 25%, 33%, 30%, and 26% (see Table 3).

Students were asked if they had changed their mind on categories which they had generated individually as compared with the group's report of consensus items. Interestingly, a large majority of students (77% in Study 2) said the process of reaching group consensus did not change their own original opinion, and in addition, verbal reports from a majority of students indicated that the group consensus was reflective of their own opinion. These findings are contrary to the individual data indicating that there were many more individual differences than the group reported as consensus. This paradox was found in Study 1; Study 2, Part I; and Study 2, Part II--with training as well as in the absence of training.

It is interesting to note that in many cases where students reported no change in their views as a result of the group process, they did comment that they became aware of additional ideas and categories that they had not generated on their own. Although these comments indicated that more

---

[3]There were originally four groups in Study 1, but one of the groups, Group 2, was eliminated since students in this group did not follow directions relative to consensus items. They recorded, "The values are the same as those of the culture-at-large." They did not list what the values were.

categories may have been discussed in the group process, what came out of the group were fewer categories--fewer than the individuals generated collectively, and, for the most part, fewer than individuals had generated prior to the group experience.

Results of Study 3 (With training)

Results of Study 3 replicate the findings of Study 1 and Study 2, Part I. In each case there was little agreement between individuals and group consensus, yet individuals reported high agreement between their response and group consensus. There was virtually no difference in Study 3 related to content.

We were asked if the findings above would hold up for different content. It was pointed out that the book we used had different political and satirical content in the different sections--first, second, third. We found that Study 3 replicated Studies 1 and 2 for each content area. There was no difference by content areas of the book. This, however, could be different with another kind of book, e.g., using a non-comic strip approach.

Results & Conclusions

Results are reported here as they match the six objectives of the investigation (see page 3). The first objective was to replicate findings of previous studies. As one can see from Tables 1, 2, and 4 as well as the text above which describes our analysis, the findings of Study 1 were replicated in Study 2, Part I and Study 3, Part I.

The second objective was to estimate the effect of training subjects in coding techniques on change in their interpretation. This is where we found one of the most intriguing aspects of the whole investigation. We discovered that our subjects phenomenologically indicated high agreement with the group, while their responses indicated low agreement. There were no subjects who

indicated that there was high disagreement between the individual responses and the group consensus. This was determined by a question that all subjects were asked, "Did your views change as a result of the group's attempt to reach consensus"?

The third objective was to estimate the effect of training subjects in coding techniques towards increasing group consensus (within-group agreement). The findings in the differences in consensus between Study 2, Part I and Study 2, Part II, and between Study I and Study 2, Part II, indicated that training had very little, if any, effect on within-group consensus.

The fourth objective was to estimate the effect of training subjects in coding techniques towards increasing generalizability across groups (across-group agreement). As one can see from the final column of Tables 1-5, and the mean agreement for the separate studies between groups, there was relatively little agreement between groups for each of the categories. The average number of agreements between groups without training compared to the average number of groups with training indicated that training did not increase the amount of agreement between groups. There were two notable exceptions as seen in 1) Table 4--Study 3, Part I, Category 6, *Importance of Relationships*,, with 80% agreement, and 2) Table 5--Study 3, Part II, Category 9, *Gender Differences*, also with 80% agreement. The percentages of between-group agreement were similar regardless of training/no-training or content. This surprised us. We expected to have greater between-group agreement than within-group. We thought that the interaction between individuals necessary to achieve consensus would have a collapsing effect which would contribute to greater agreement between groups. In this investigation we did not find this to be true.

The fifth objective was to estimate agreement between subjects for the identified categories. Tables 1-5 indicated that the agreement between subjects on the elicitation of categories tended to increase when training was used. These mean increases were concomitant with increases in standard deviations and were not significantly different. They are as follows:

		Mean	SD
Study 2,	Part I (No training)	4.97	2.78
	Part II (With training)	5.85	4.36
Study 3	Part I (No training)	3.63	2.79
	Part II (With training)	4.29	3.24

The sixth objective was to estimate the effect of content differences within and across groups. Study 3, Tables 4 and 5, reflect the findings that indicated content had virtually no effect on the respondents' percentage of agreement individually or in groups.

Discussion & Implications

In Study 2 (MacDonald et al., 1993) and in Study 3, in part, we replicated Study 1 (Newman & MacDonald, 1993), but also looked at the effects of training students in coding methodology on interpretation of qualitative data and consensus within and between groups. Results of the second and third studies are very similar to the first study. Although it appears that training in coding methods increased the perceived number of categories, it seemed to have little or no effect on agreement within and between groups when compared to the first study, where students had not received training. There are a variety of possible explanations for this outcome.

There were different individuals classifying student categories in Study 1 as compared with Studies 2 and 3. This could explain some differences between Study 1 and Studies 2 and 3. However, it would not account for

difference or lack of difference in Parts I and II of Study 2 and parts I and II of Study 3; the person classifying the categories was the same for these.

There were some overall differences in the makeup of the two classes, those in Study 2 being generally older than Study 1, more frequently in practice as teachers, administrators, counselors, or social workers; and, those in Study 1 tending to be younger, non-practitioner, and in many cases, preparing for careers in counseling psychology. The class composition in Study 3 tended to be like a combination of the Study 1 and Study 2 groups, with the addition of a sub-set of students studying higher education. We cannot, at this point, gauge the impact that these differences had on outcomes of the three studies, but again, this would not have affected comparisons between Parts I and II of Study 2, and similarly, with Study 3.

In general, there was a fair amount of naivete in the students asked to do the coding, which was reflected in how they did the coding and the consequent generation of categories. This naivete was obvious in looking at their attempted coding of the cartoon culture. This feature may or may not be more problematic in these studies than one would suspect to be the case for those who actually do qualitative research.

As one can see from our data, individuals thought they actually received more information by discussing in group, yet what always came out of the group was a sub-set of all the individual responses. It appears that one does get more information by discussing things in groups, but that the aggregated consensus in the group is less than the total of all the individual responses, and that agreement between groups on the consensus items was not any better than agreement between consensus items for individuals in the groups. Actually, the areas where the individuals had the highest agreement are not reflected in the consensus statement.

The person who analyzed the student categories for Studies 2 and 3 reported difficulty and frustration since some of the students' categories and the way they elaborated on them depended upon so many nuances and subtleties. The use of a cartoon culture, especially a satirical one, may have presented some unique problems in this regard. For example, "sexism" in the cartoon culture was found in a sequence (there were other examples of "sexism" in the book as well) in which some of the book's male characters, in the presence of a very young female looking puzzled and dismayed, were describing one of the 'ladies of tele-journalism,' Diane Sawyer. They said she was 'lookin' hotter 'n a tamale,' had lips which were 'plump and pink as a June cranberry,' has been 'lookin' a might meaty in the drumsticks,' etc. (Breathed, 1992).

In interpreting a passage such as the one about Diane Sawyer, we think that some students respond to the culture in a concrete way; i.e., they interpret "sexist" references as reflecting the meaning of the culture. Others, realizing it is satirical, appear to respond to the satire; i.e., picking up on very sexist comments, they say that the cartoon is arguing against sexism by making it sound stupid. Others seem to deal with it in terms of a counter-culture and its political implications. So the same event, depending on the students' perspectives, may be coded differently.

One might argue that such a range of interpretation is a problem. We are taking the position that virtually all qualitative researchers have a perspective, whether aware or not, and that these different perspectives are likely to produce different coding responses. Using a cartoon culture may only make these discrepancies more obvious. This experience with the cartoon culture m ght be a more accurate simulation of the real problems encountered in the interpretation of qualitative data than we originally realized.

Last, we do not know how much of these results we can attribute to the quality or extent of training received by students in this graduate class, since the time allotted for training was minimal--approximately an hour out of each of three class sessions.

Importance of the Study

This data support a variety of conjectures. First, if we have individuals interpreting culture, we could easily get a perception that is difficult to agree upon because it is based on idiosyncratic analysis of data describing cultural values.

Secondly, recent mainstream thinking of qualitative and quantitative researchers suggests that (a) individuals are more likely to give rich, in-depth perceptions, (b) however, that individual data is less likely to be generalizable to other individuals perceiving this data. We originally thought that group data might be somewhat more generalizable. We thought we might use aggregated data with the expectation of more consistency and reliability, but perhaps less rich with idiosyncratic differences. However, our data suggest that generalizability was not increased by the aggregated group consensus data. This could be due to the coding problems we have identified previously, or to an inherent aspect of this type of research, as we discussed earlier.

Third, the group produced less in the way of in-depth perceptions, in these studies, fewer and more general categories than did individuals.

Fourth, the results are contrary to recent attempts by some qualitative researchers, such as Polkinghorne (1991), to generalize with qualitative research, although they say that it is a different type of generalization.

Last, one may wish to train observers to increase inter-rater reliability; however, trained observers might acquire a pre-set and see what they were trained to see, or what they were trained to see as important. It is difficult to

understand how one can be trained to observe independently of their own personal experiences and values. Training people might increase the reliability but at the potential cost of validity. Our results show that training did increase the percentage of agreement among individual raters but it was not significant.

This simulated anthropological study was done to estimate the accuracies and consistencies between individual and group perceptions on a relatively "neutral" culture (with fictitious cartoon characters). As indicated earlier, we wanted to determine the relative consistency between individuals v. groups, and we found that group predictions were not more consistent than individual predictions. We initially expected that it would increase consistency (replicability) when doing ethnographic research to have more than one observer looking at the same data. These studies, however, did not support this initial assumption. This research suggests that triangulation in the collection and analysis of data may be more problematic than we initially expected.

Our research, we believe, supports the need to do further research on qualitative methodology for the purpose of improving appropriate interpretation of qualitative research. The finding that our subjects thought they highly agreed with the group consensus when their responses indicated they did not has important implications for the interpretation of qualitative research.[4]

---

[4]Note: This investigation was done in three parts, the first two studies having been reported individually. Prior to doing Study 3, it was thought desirable to re-evaluate the categorizations and calculations arrived at in Study 2. What we found in doing this were some minor errors in the categorization process as well as a minor addition error. However, the corrections did not change the substantive interpretation of the data at all. .

References

Breathed, B. (1992). Politically, fashionably, and aerodynamically incorrect. The First Outland Collection. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.

Constas, M. A. (1992). Qualitative analysis as a public event: The documentation of category development procedures. American Educational Research Journal, 29 (2).

Eisner, E. W., & Peshkin, A. (1990). Qualitative inquiry in education: The continuing debate. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.

Erickson, F. (1988). Qualitative methods in research on teaching. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.). Handbook of research on teaching (pp. 119-161). New York: Macmillan.

Firestone, W. ... (1993). Alternative arguments for generalizing from data as applied to qualitative research. Educational Researcher, 22 (4).

Geertz, C. (1973). The interpretation of cultures. New York: Basic Books, Inc.

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1982). Epistemological and methodological bases of naturalistic inquiry. Educational Communications and Technology Journal, 4 (30).

Howe, K., & Eisenhart, M. (1990). Documentation of Category Development Procedures. Educational Researcher, 19 (4).

Kirk, J., & Miller, M. L. (1986). Reliability and validity in qualitative research. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

LeCompte, M. D., & Goetz, J. P. (1982, Spring). Problems of reliability and validity in ethnographic research. Review of Educational Research, 51 (1), 31-60.

MacDonald, S., Newman, I., Waite, K., & Potts, B. (1993, October). Qualitative analysis of a synthetic culture: A methodological inquiry. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Mid-western Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

Newman, I., & Benz, C. R. (1992). Qualitative-quantitative research methodology: Exploring the interactive continuum. Technical report. Akron, OH: University of Akron Office of Educational Research.

Newman, I., & MacDonald, S. (1993, May). Interpreting qualitative data: A methodological inquiry. Paper presented at the meeting of the Ohio Academy of Science, Youngstown, OH.

Peshkin, A. (1993). The goodness of qualitative research. <u>Educational Researcher,</u> <u>22</u> (2), 24-30.

Polkinghorne, D. E. (1991). <u>Generalization and qualitative research: Issues of external validity.</u> Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

Spradley, J. P. (1979). <u>The ethnographic interview.</u> New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Table 1

Categories of Cultural Values Elicited From Respondents Answering Question #3 *1

Elicited Categories *2	Group 1 A	B	C	D	E	F	G	T	Y/N	Group 2 A	B	C	D	E	F	G	T	Y/N	Group 3 A	B	C	D	E	F	T	Y/N	Group 4 A	B	C	D	E	F	*3	T	Y/N	%IND *5	%GRP *6
1. ENJO	X	X			X	X		4				X				X	2								0									0	Y	23	25
2. ANTI-MAT		X		X				2				X			X	X	3								0									0		19	0
3. MINORI		X	X					2	Y	X						X	2							X	1		X					X		2		28	25
4. INDIVID						X		1	Y								0			X	X	X	X	X	5	Y			X	X				2		31	50
5. XENOPH					X	X		2									0								0									0		8	0
6. HONEST				X		X		2									0								0									0		8	0
7. POL CORR								0									0								0									0			0
8. ANTI-INDIV					X	X		2									0								0									0		8	0
9. ANTI-FREE						X		1									0								0									0		4	0
10. MATERIAL						X		1		X		X					2								0									0		12	0
11. WOM EXPL						X		1									0								0									0		4	0
12. LABEL PEO					X	X		2					X				1								0			X			X			2	Y	19	25
13. MEN AGGR						X		1									0								0									0		4	0
14. FRIENDSH						X		1	Y				X				1								0					X	X			2	Y	15	50
15. ENVIRON								0			X	X		X			3		X				X	X	3			X	X					2		31	0
16. FAMILY								0					X				1						X		1									0		8	0
17. FUT TIME						X		1									0		X						1	Y								0		8	25
18. IMP GROUP				X		X		2				X	X				2								0									0		15	0
19. POL ORG						X		1							X		1		X				X		2				X	X	X			3	Y	28	25
%AGR BET IND/GRP *7								19									0								33									66			

*1 Question #3 Is: Describe this culture (what are the cultural values?).

*2 Elicited Categories are described more fully below

*3 Letters indicate individual group members

*4 Group response is reported by 1) tally of individual group members' written responses prior to group discussion, and 2) Indication of YES if the category was included as part of group consensus

*5 Percentage of raters which indicated this category

*7 Percentage of within group differences between individual and consensus categories

Table 2 (Study 2, Part 1)

Categories of Cultural Values Elicited From Respondents Answering Question #3 *1

Elicited Categories *2	Group 1							Group 2							Group 3							Group 4							Group 5							% IN *5	G P AGR *6
	A	B	C	D	E	T	Y/N	A	B	C	D	E	T	Y/N	A	B	C	D	E	T	N/Y	A	B	C	D	E	T	Y/N	A	B	C	D	*3	T	Y/N		
1. ENJO/PLEA	X					1				X			1		X					1				X			1		X	X				2	Y	25	20
2. ANTI-EST		X		X		2	Y	X	X	X			3		X		X		X	3	Y	X	X		X		3							0		46	40
3. PRO-EST						0			X				1							0		X	X				2							0		13	0
4. MIN P VIEW						0			X		X		2	Y			X			1	Y						0			X				1	Y	17	60
5. SEXISM				X		1							0				X			1	Y	X	X	X	X	X	5	Y		X	X	X		3		42	40
6. EMP RELSH	X					1				X	X		2				X			1					X		2	Y		X				1	Y	29	40
7. XENO/LABL		X				1	Y						0							0				X		X	2				X			1		17	20
8. HON/JUST						0				X			1			X				1							0							0		8	0
9. POL CORR				X		1			X				1	Y						0							0			X	X			2	Y	17	40
10. AULT/GRO						0				X			1			X	X			2			X		X		2				X			1		25	0
11. GEND DIFF		X				1	Y				X		1							0				X			1				X			1		17	20
12. EFF MEDIA		X				1			X				1	Y						0		Y		X		X	2			X				1		21	40
13. PRO-VIOL			X			1	Y		X				1							0		X	X	X		X	4							0		25	20
14. ANT-VIOL						0							0							0							0				X			1		4	0
15. L OF EX/GR						0			X	X			2							0				X			1			X	X			2		21	0
16. SUP/STERE						0				X			1			X				1	Y	X	X		X		3	Y						0		21	40
17. L OF WK ET						0							0							0				X	X		2	Y	X	X				2		17	20
18. L OF VAL ED				X		1				X			1							0				X	X		2	Y	X	X				2		25	20
19. VALU TECH						0							0							0				X		X	2							0		8	0
20. HEDONISM	X					1							0		X					1							0					X		1		13	0
21. LOYALTY	X					1	Y						0			X				1				X			1							0		13	0
22. PRO-ENVIR	X			X		2			X	X			2							0		X	X	X	X	X	5	Y	X		X			2	Y	46	40
23. ANTI-MAT						0			X		X		2	Y						0				X			1							0		13	20
24. PRO-MAT		X	X		X	3	Y						0		X		X	X		3			X		X		2	Y						0		33	40
25. EXP OTHER				X		1							0							0				X	X	X	3					X		1		21	0
26. INDIV RGHT	X	X		X		3					X		1			X				1							0							0		21	0
27. L OF TRUST						0							0							0				X			1							0		4	0
28. L OF RESP						0							0							0				X			1							0		4	0
29. SARC/SAT		X		X	X	3				X	X		2				X			1	Y		X	X			2				X	X		2		42	20
30. SOCIAL ISS						0							0							0				X			1			X	X	X		3		17	0
%AGR BET IND				35							22							54							30							28					

*1 Question #3 is: Describe this culture (what are the cultural values?).

*2 Elicited Categories are described more fully below

*3 Letters indicate individual group members

*4 Group response is reported by 1) tally of individual group members' written responses prior to group discussion, and 2) indication of YES if the category was included as part of group consensus

*5 Percentage of raters which indicated this category

*6 Percentage of groups that were in consensus on this category

*7 Percentage of within group differences between individual and consensus categories

Table 3 (Study 2, Part 2)

Categories of Cultural Values Elicited From Respondents Answering Question #3 *1

Elicited Categories *2	G1 A	B	C	D	E	T	Y/N	G2 A	B	C	D	T	Y/N	G3 A	B	C	D	E	T	N/Y	G4 A	B	C	D	E	T	Y/N	G5 A	B	C	D	T	Y/N	% IND *5	% GRP *6
1. ENJO/PLEA				X		1						0				X			1				X			1		X				1	Y	17	20
2. ANTI-EST				X		1	Y		X			1				X		X	2	Y			X		X	2			X			1		29	40
3. MIN P VIEW			X	X		2			X			1	Y	X	X	X			3	Y			X		X	2			X			1	Y	38	60
4. SEXISM	X		X			2		X	X		X	3			X				1	Y		X		X	X	3	Y	X				1	Y	42	40
5. EMP RELSHP	X			X		2			X			1			X	X	X		3		X	X	X			3	Y	X		X	X	3	Y	50	40
6. XENO/LABL						0	Y		X			1							0		X	X		X	X	4						0		21	20
7. HON/JUST				X		1					X	1							0							0						0		8	0
8. POL CORR			X	X	X	3			X		X	2	Y		X		X	X	2			X		X	X	3		X	X	X		3	Y	54	40
9. AULT/GROW			X	X	X	3						0		X		X	X		3		X	X	X	X	4			X			1		46	0
10. GEND DIFF	X		X			2	Y			X	X	2		X		X	X		3		X	X	X	X	5		X	X	X		3		63	20
11. EFF MEDIA			X	X		2		X	X			2	Y			X			1	Y		X	X		3		X	X			2		42	40
12. PRO-VIOL	X		X			2	Y	X	X			2							0		X	X		X	X	4		X	X	X	X	4		50	20
13. ANT-VIOL						0						0							0							0			X			1		4	0
14. L OF EX/GR			X			1						0							0		X	X		X		3		X				1	Y	21	20
15. SUP/STERE	X		X	X		3			X			1				X			1	Y	X	X		X		3	Y	X	X			2		42	40
16. L OF WK ET						0						0							0							0	Y					0		0	20
17. L OF VAL ED						0						0							0							0	Y					0		0	20
18. VALUE TECH	X		X			1						0				X			1							0						0		13	0
19. LOYALTY						0	Y					0							0							0						0		0	20
20. PRO-ENVRO	X			X		2			X			1							0	Y		X	X		2	Y	X	X		X	3	Y	33	60
21. ANTI-MAT						0		Y				0							0							0						0		0	20
22. PRO-MAT	X		X		X	3	Y					0				X			1		X	X	X	X	4	Y	X	X			2		42	40
23. EXP OTHER		X				1						0							0			X			1						0		8	0
24. IND RIGHTS	X					1						0							0							0				X		1		8	0
25. L OF TRUST						0						0			X			X	2		X					1						0		13	0
26. RESP ELDER						0					X	1							0							0						0		4	0
27. SARC/SATI						0				X	X	2			X	X			2				X	X		2		X	X			2		33	0
28. IMP OF FAM	X			X		2						0		X		X	X		3			X	X			2				X		1		29	0
29. POLITICS						0			X			1		X	X	X	X		4			X				1				X	X	2		33	0
30. SOC VALUE						0						0			X		X		2							0			X			1		13	0
31. DATING	X		X	X		3					X	1		X		X			2					X		1		X				1		33	0
32. HEDONISM	X			X		2						0							0							0						0		8	0
33. P/SOC CHA						0						0				X	X		2		X		X	X	3						0		21	0
34. CHILDERN						0						0							0		X	X			2			X			1		13	0
% AGR BET IND						29						25							33							30						26			

*1 Question #3 is: Describe this culture (what are the cultural values?).

*2 Elicited Categories are described more fully below

*3 Letters indicate individual group members

*4 Group response is reported by 1) tally of individual group members' written responses prior to group discussion, and 2) indication of YES if the category was included as part of group consensus

*5 Percentage of raters which indicated this category

*6 Percentage of groups that were in consesus on this categy

*7 Percentage of within group differences between individual and consensus categories

23

Table 4 (Study 3 Part 1)

Categories of Cultural Values Elicited From Respondents Answering Question #3 *1

Elicited Categories *2	Group 1 A	B	C	D	T	Y/N	GROUP 2 A	B	C	D	T	Y/N	GROUP 3 A	B	C	D	E	T	Y/N	Group 4 A	B	C	D	T	Y/N	Group 5 A	B	C	D *3	T	Y/N	% IND *5	% GRP *6
1. ENJO/PLEA			X	X	2				X	X	2			X	X			2						0			X		X	2	Y	38	20
2. ANTI-EST	X			X	2	Y			X		1	Y	X					1	Y		X			1				X		1		29	60
3. PRO-EST					0		X				1							0						0						0		5	0
4. MIN P VIEW					0		Y	X	X		2			X				1		X		X		2	Y					0		24	40
5. SEXISM			X		1	Y					0	Y		X		X	X	3	Y			X		0				X		1	Y	24	60
6. IMP OF RE			X	X	2	Y	X			X	2				X	X		2	Y	X			X	2	Y			X		2	Y	48	80
7. HON/JUST					0		X				1					X		1						0						0		10	0
8. POL CORR				X	1						0			X				1						0						0		10	0
9. ALT/GRO/EX					0		X	X	X	X	4							0				X		1	Y				X	1		29	20
10. GEND DIFF					0				X		1							0						0						0		5	0
11. XENOPHOB					0		X				1	Y			X			1						0				X		1	Y	14	40
12. EFF OF MED					0						0			X				1				X		1				X		1		14	0
13. SUP/STER					0	Y					0					X		1	Y					0						0		5	40
14. L OF WK ET	X	X			2						0	Y						0						0				X		1		14	20
15. L OF V ED	X	X			2						0							0					X	1				X		1	Y	19	20
14. VAL OF ED					0		X				1							0						0						0		5	0
15. HEDONISM					0					X	1							0						0						0		5	0
16. PRO ENV				X	1		X		X	X	3	Y		X	X			2	Y				X	1			X			1		38	20
17. ANTI-MAT					0						0							0				X		1						0		5	0
18. PRO-MAT					0		X			X	2	Y	X					1						0			X			1		19	20
19. EX OTHERS					0				X		1		X					1						0				X	X	2		19	0
20. IND RIGHTS		X			1					X	1							0	Y	X				1						0		14	20
21. SAR/SATIR	X			X	2	Y		X			1		X	X	X		X	4		X		X		2	Y					1		48	40
22. POL/SOC	X		X		2		X	X			2			X	X			2	Y				X	1				X		1		38	20
23. PRO-VIOL					0						0			X		X		2					X	1			X	X		2	Y	24	20
24. ANTI-VIOL					0						0							0						0				X		1		5	0
25. VAL TECH					0						0							0					X	1						0		5	0
26. AVD RELAL					0						0			X		X		2				X		1				X		1		19	0
27. ANAR/CHA					0						0		X					1		X				1	Y					0	Y	10	40
28. OPENNESS					0						0						X	1						0						0		5	0
29. ACHIEVE					0					X	1							0						0						0		5	0
30. L OF PRIVA					0						0							0						0				X		1		5	0
% AGR BET INC					36						17							32						33						39			

*1 Question #3 is: Describe this culture (what are the cultural values?).

*2 Elicited Categories are described more fully below

*3 Letters indicate individual group members

*4 Group response is reported by 1) tally of individual group members' written responses prior to group discussion, and 2) indication of YES if the category was included as part of group consensus

*5 Percentage of raters which indicated this category

*6 Percentage of groups that were in consesus on this categy

*7 Percentage of within group differences between individual and consensus categories

24

Table 5 (Study 3, Part 2)

Categories of Cultural Values Elicited From Respondents Answering Question #3 *1

Elicited Categories *2 — Group 1 / GROUP 2 / GROUP 3 / Group 4 / Group 5. (*3 Letters indicate individual group members)

Elicited Categories *2	1A	1B	1C	1D	1T	1Y/N	2A	2B	2C	2D	2T	2Y/N	3A	3B	3C	3D	3E	3T	3Y/N	4A	4B	4C	4D	4T	4Y/N	5A	5B	5C	5D	5*3	5T	5Y/N	% IND *5	% GRP *6
1. ENJO/PLEA		X			1				X		1			X	X	X		3			X	X		2	Y	X		X	X		3		48	20
2. ANTI-EST			X		1						0							0						0			X				1		10	0
3. MIN P VIEW		X			1				X		1							0				X		1	Y	X		X			2		24	20
4. SEXISM			X		1					X	1			X		X	X	3			X			1			X				1		33	0
5. IMP OF RE		X	X		2	Y	X	X	X		3	Y		X	X			2	Y		X	X		2		X		X			2	Y	52	60
6. HON/JUST			X		1	Y					0							0						0							0		5	20
7. POL CORR			X		1						0			X				1	Y					0							0		10	20
8. ALT/GRO/EX		X	X		2		X	X	X		3			X	X			2						0		X		X	X		3	Y	10	20
9. GEND DIFF			X	X	2			X	X		2	Y		X	X			2	Y		X			1	Y	X	X				2	Y	10	80
10. XENOPHOB			X		1						0							0				X		1							0		10	0
11. EFF OF MED					0		X	X	X		3			X	X	X		3						0			X	X			2	Y	10	20
12. SUP/STER					0			X		X	2			X	X	X		3						0		X	X	X	X		4		43	0
13. L OF WK ET					0			X			1							0						0							0		5	0
15. VAL OF ED					0						0							0						0				X			1		5	0
17. PRO ENV		X	X		2				X		1			X				1						0							0		19	0
19. PRO-MAT			X		1						0			X				1						0			X				1		14	0
20. EX OTHERS					0						0							0			X			1							0		5	0
21. IND RIGHTS					0		X		X		2							0						0							0		10	0
22. SAR/SATIR					0						0			X				1						0							0		5	0
23. POL/SOC			X		1						0			X				1						0							0		5	0
24. PRO-VIOL				X	1					X	1			X	X			2						0							0		19	0
25. ANTI-VIOL				X	1					X	1			X	X			2						0							0		19	0
26. VAL TECH					0						0						X	1						0							0		5	0
27. AVD RELAL					0						0				X			1			X			1							0		10	0
28. ANAR/CHA					0						0							0				X		1							0		5	0
29. AGING					0					X	1			X				1				X		1						X	1		19	0
30. MID CLAS					0						0				X			1	Y					0							0		5	20
31. FAMILY			X	X	2				X		1		X		X	X		3		X				1							0		33	0
32. DATING			X		1					X	1			X	X			2	Y		X			1				X	X		2		19	0
33. L OF GROW			X		1						0			X	X			2	Y		X			1			X				1		29	20
34. LIS TO OTH			X		1	Y					0							0						0							0		5	0
35. READING					0			X			1			X	X	X		3						0				X	X		2		29	0
% AGR BET INC *7					17						12							23						36							24			

*1 Question #3 is: Describe this culture (what are the cultural values?).
*2 Elicited Categories are described more fully below
*3 Letters indicate individual group members
*4 Group response is reported by 1) tally of individual group members' written responses prior to group discussion, and 2) indication of YES if the category was included as part of group consensus
*5 Percentage of raters which indicated this category
*6 Percentage of groups that were in consensus on this category
*7 Percentage of within group differences between individual and consensus categories

Elicited Categories:

TABLE 1
1. Enjoy life,have fun
2. Anti-materialistic (Anti-mainstream, anti-defense anti-republican)
3. Speak for minorities (minority viewpoints. not just ethnic minority)
4. Individualistic
5. Xenophobic
6. Emphasis on honesty
7. Politically correct
8. Anti-individualistic
9. Anti-personal freedom
10. Materialistic
11. Women exploited
12. Labeling people
13. Men aggressive
14. Emphasis on friendship
15. Emphasis on environmental
16. Emphasis on family
17. Future time orientation
18. Importance of group
19. Political organizations

TABLE 2
1. Enjoy life/pleasure
2. Anti-establishment, anti-mainstream, anti-government
3. Pro-establishment, anti-mainstream, anti-government
4. Speak for minorities (minority viewpoints, not just ethnic minority)
5. Sexism (male and female)
6. Importance of relationships
7. Xenophobic/labeling
8. Honesty/justice
9. Political correctness
10. Altruism/personal growth
11. Gender differences
12. Effects of the media
13. Pro-violence
14. Anti-violence
15. Lack of existential factors and personal growth
16. Superficial/ stereotypes
17. Lack of work ethic
18. Lack of value of education
19. Value technology
20. Hedonism
21. Loyalty to others
22. Pro-environmental
23. Anti-materialistic
24. Pro-materialistic
25. Exploit others

26. Individual rights
27. Lack of trust
28. Lack of responsibility
29. Sarcasm/satire

TABLE 3
1. Enjoy life/pleasure
2. Anti-establishment, anti-mainstream, anti-government
3. Speak for minorities (minority viewpoints, not just ethnic minority)
4. Sexism (male and female)
5. Importance of relationships
6. Xenophobic/labeling
7. Honesty/justice
8. Political correctness
9. Altruism/personal growth
10. Gender differences
11. Effects of the media
12. Pro-violence
13. Anti-violence
14. Lack of existential factors and personal grow
15. Superficial/stereotypes
16. Lack of work ethic
17. Lack of value of education
18. Value technology
19. Loyalty to others
20. Pro-environmental
21. Anti-materialistic
22. Pro-materialistic
23. Exploit others
24. Individual rights
25. Lack of trust
26. Lack of responsibility
27. Sarcasm/satire
28. Importance of family
29. Politics
30. Social values
31. Dating
32. Argument
33. Personal/social change
34. Children

(Continued on next page)

Elicited Categories (Continued):

TABLE 4

1. Enjoy life/pleasure
2. Anti-establishment, anti-mainstream, anti-government
3. Pro-establishment, anti-mainstream, anti-government
4. Speak for minorities/ Tolerance of Diverity (minority viewpoints, not just ethnic minority`
5. Sexism (male and female)
6. Importance of relationships
7. Honesty/justice
8. Political correctness
9. Altruism/personal growth/ existential factors
10. Gender differences
11. Xenophobic/labeling
12. Effects of the media
13. Superficial/stereotypes
14. Lack of work ethic
15. Lack of value of education
16. Value of education
17. Hedonism
18. Pro-environmental
19. Anti-materialistic
20. Pro-materialistic
21. Exploit others
22. Individual rights
23. Sarcasm/satire
24. Political/social issues
25. Pro-violence
26. Anti-violence
27. Value technology
28. Avoidance of reality
29. Anarchy/change
30. Openness
31. Achievement
32. Lack of privacy

11. Xenophobic/labeling
12. Effects of the media
13. Superficial/stereotypes
14. Lack of work ethic
15. Value of education
16. Pro-environmental
17. Pro-materialistic
18. Exploit others
19. Individual rights
20. Sarcasm/satire
21. Political/social issues
22. Pro-violence
23. Anti-violence
24. Value technology
25. Avoidence of reality
26. Anarchy/change
27. Aging
28. Middle class
29. Family
30. Dating
31. Lack of growth
32. Listen to others
33. Reading

TABLE 5

1. Enjoy life/pleasure
2. Anti-establishment, anti-mainstream, anti-government
3. Speak for minorities/ tolerance of Diverity (minority viewpoints, not just ethnic minority)
5. Sexism (male and female)
6. Importance of relationships
7. Honesty/justice
8. Political correctness
9. Altruism/personal growth/ existential facors
10. Gender differences