

EDUC 85518 Portfolio

Andrew J. Cerniglia

August 2, 2008

Contents

1	Research Proposal	3
1.1	Introduction	3
1.2	Theoretical Framework	3
1.3	Research Purpose	4
1.4	Methods	5
1.4.1	Sample	5
1.4.2	Data Collection	6
1.4.3	Data Management	6
1.5	Analytic Processes	7
1.6	Interpretations	8
1.7	Trustworthiness	8
2	Log	10
3	Journal	12
3.1	June 14, 2008	12
3.2	June 15, 2008	12
3.3	June 17, 2008	13
3.4	June 18, 2008	14
3.5	June 19, 2008	15
3.6	June 20, 2008	16
3.7	June 21, 2008	17
3.8	June 23, 2008	18
3.9	June 26, 2008	20
3.10	June 30, 2008	21
3.11	July 3, 2008	22
3.12	July 8, 2008	25
3.13	July 9, 2008	25
3.14	July 11, 2008	26
3.15	July 15, 2008	27
3.16	July 16, 2008	28
3.17	July 17, 2008	28

3.18 July 19, 2008	29
3.19 July 20, 2008	30
3.20 July 21, 2008	31
3.21 July 22, 2008	31
3.22 July 25, 2008	32
3.23 July 28, 2008	32
4 Excerpts from: <i>The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research</i> by Barney G. Glaser and Anselm L. Strauss	34
4.1 Chapter 1: The Discovery of Grounded Theory	34
4.2 Chapter 2: Grounded Theory	35
4.3 Chapter 3: Theoretical Sampling	37
4.4 Chapter 4: From Substance to Formal Theory	39
4.5 Chapter 5: The Constant comparative Method of Qualitative Analysis	40
4.6 Chapter 6: Classifying and Assessing Comparative Studies	42
4.7 Chapter 7: New Sources for Qualitative Data	43
4.8 Chapter 8: Theoretical Elaboration of Quantitative Data	46
4.9 Chapter 9: The Credibility of Grounded Theory	49
4.10 Chapter 10: Applying Grounded Theory	50
4.11 Chapter 11: Insight and Theory Development	52
5 Transcript of Interview: July 25, 2008	53
6 Consent Forms	96
References	99

1 Research Proposal

1.1 Introduction

Traditionally, the quality of long-term memory has been measured quantitatively by one's ability to either recall or recognize information. Additionally, these qualities are often observed after a relatively short time period, several weeks at the most. The author is unaware of any studies, quantitative in nature, that seek to understand an individual's ability to perform either of these tasks after much longer periods of time. Further, insight into the qualities of long-term memories from in-school experiences promises to add to a complex and evolving understanding of schooling processes.

[Anderson and Shimizu](#) (2007) have done a series of qualitative studies investigating long term memories of individuals who attended the 1970 Japan World Exposition. The authors suggest that three psychological factors tend to influence what individuals recall of events from long ago, affect, agenda fulfillment, and rehearsal. Their findings support the first two. That is to say that the participants in their study tended to recall events that affected them in some way, often times negatively, or those that fulfilled some existing expectation of what was to occur. However, [Anderson and Shimizu](#) (2007) complete their piece by explaining that their previous work has demonstrated that memory rehearsal, when employed, tends to be the most significant of the three.

1.2 Theoretical Framework

The advance of technology foreshadows an imminent and fundamental shift in the ways in which schools are structured and students are taught. Central to this dramatic shift that some have predicted is the idea that extant curricula and pedagogy will be replaced with those regarded more appropriate for the new generations. As Mark Prensky (personal communication, July 16, 2008) questions, why should we teach long division when we have machines that can perform these types of tasks? What is our rationale for continuing to focus on cursive writing in the elementary years? Why not focus on the creation of products through collaborative endeavors supported by the use of technology?

It is my contention that this predicted change lends itself to a secondary, but more fundamental shift. If we move towards a more flexible, student centered curriculum, might we also be opening the door to more enthusiastic, intrinsically motivated individuals. Motivation can be categorized as either intrinsic or extrinsic in nature ([Gilman & Anderman](#), 2006; [Rovai, Ponton, Wighting, & Baker](#), 2007; [Vansteenkiste, Lens, & Deci](#), 2006; [Young](#), 2005). Several subclasses and alternative definitions exist. *Intrinsic motivation* refers to motivation derived from an individual's inner needs or from the natural appeal of the activity itself. Conversely, extrinsic motivation is most often related to external rewards, and

tends to place a greater value on competition and standards (Young, 2005).

The removal of constraints in terms of what is taught allows educators to concentrate on *complexity of thought* rather than *exposure to or acquisition of information*. Students are allowed to, within reason, work within areas of personal interest, and in this way are autonomous. Autonomy is, broadly defined, freedom of choice, and is related to motivation. Autonomous motivation “involves the experience of volition and choice” whereas controlled motivation is distinguished as being “pressured or coerced” (Vansteenkiste et al., 2006, p 19).

Furthermore, an increase in autonomy corresponds to an increase in intrinsic motivation (Rovai et al., 2007). The degree to which an individual is allowed to make their own decisions about the learning experience is related to their autonomy and the locus of control. Locus of control describes the perception as to which agent within a relationship directs experiences. An autonomous individual also possesses an internal locus of control (Young, 2005), meaning they identify themselves as the governing agent.

Moreover, it could be deduced that from this enthusiasm and motivation follows more meaningful learning which should facilitate the ability to access information over a longer period of time. That is, the combination of autonomy in terms of *what* is studied and *how* it is studied is seen as exceptionally powerful. To be clear, this duo is not believed to be directly related to complexity of thought. Rather, it is perceived as a catalyst, that if harnessed by an instructor has the potential to facilitate the in-depth study of a topic. It is this in-depth, self-regulated behavior, also referred to as “independent” learners (Sadler-Smith & Riding, 1999) or learners possessing a “natural growth orientation” (Vansteenkiste et al., 2006), both of which *are* more closely related to complexity of thought.

1.3 Research Purpose

This study seeks to gain a primitive understanding of what individuals can recall from their educative experiences. More specifically, I will be looking to describe the ways in which individuals, many years removed from their high school experiences, describe learning experiences that they are able to access in long-term memory. It should be noted that the accuracy of these memories are not a focus of the study, as it could be argued (convincingly) that the accuracy of such memories is questionable.

The veracity of participants' recollections is not within the scope of this project. There is merit to studying individuals' remembrances from their schooling regardless of the degree to which memories align with what truly transpired. Individuals are, by definition, different. The idiosyncrasies in what they remember

learning and the perceptions as to *why* they've remembered that information is the precise focus of this study.

1.4 Methods

The proposed study draws on the tenets of qualitative research. The participants' recollection of high school experiences are perceived to be phenomenological in nature, in that they would be describing "the meaning ... of their *lived experiences*" (Creswell, 2006, p. 57). Thus, if the precise focus of the study was those high school experiences, a phenomenological approach might be appropriate. However, those experiences are subordinate to the primary focus of the study, what is recalled and each individual's rationale as to why that information is accessible.

It is quite likely, though not necessary, that the stated reason will be contextually bound to the participant's high school experience. However, due to the possible disparity of participant responses, both in terms of what they recall and their stated interpretation of contributing events, the innate malleability of grounded theory is attractive. Thus, the presented study attempts to follow the guidelines of grounded theory set out by Glaser and Strauss (1967) in terms of the way in which data is procured and, especially, the procedures used for analysis. The specifics of these procedures are discussed in detail below.

1.4.1 Sample

The initial sample of six individuals, three males and three females, will be selected from the 1978 graduating class of a midwestern high school. This will entail an age range of 47 – 49, which will place the period of time in question roughly 30 years in the past. Negotiation for entry will be through the class president, who is assumed to have maintained contact with a sufficient number of classmates. Choosing the initial participants from the same school ensures some degree of continuity in terms of high school experiences.

In accordance with the prescriptions of grounded theory, the final quantity of interviewees will be informed by the developing theory (Goulding, 1998). Moreover, "theoretical sampling", or the "process of data collection for generating theory whereby the analyst jointly collects, codes, and analyzes his data and decides what data to collect next and where to find them, in order to develop his theory as it emerges" (Glaser & Strauss, 1967, p. 45), will be utilized. There is no need to solicit additional individuals prior to the completion of the initial interviews, as they will provide for the initial creation of categories which, in turn, will furnish sufficient guidance in terms of how to proceed in the effort to generate theory.

1.4.2 Data Collection

Semi-structured n-depth interviews will be utilized to procure the data (initially) for this project. The interview protocol will be evolutionary in nature, as the sessions will commence with a very general question, “What do you remember learning in high school and what about the learning experience do you recall?”. It should be noted that the precise nature and wording of this question is not necessarily required according to [Brown, Stevens, Troiano, and Schneider](#) (2002). Moreover, a premium will be placed on depth rather than breadth ([Rabiee](#), 2004). The processes following the answering of this question will be constrained only by the guidance provided by the desire to understand what is recalled and to what that recollection is attributed, and a desire to allow interviewees to speak in an expository style.

Initial interviews are expected to take between forty-five and ninety minutes. Field notes focused on the capturing of nonverbal forms of communication, e.g. body language or facial expressions, will be penned as the interview transpires. Member checking will be scheduled after an initial review of data. However, this procedure is tentative. Focus groups may well be utilized as well, most likely near the end of the study. The actual time in the field as well as the types of data collected will be determined by the conditions therein, and through the continual analysis of data until “saturation” has been reached. [Glaser and Strauss](#) (1967, p. 61) advise that saturation “means that no additional data are being found whereby the sociologist can develop properties of the category.” This is the framework by which saturation will be assessed.

It must be added that the similarity and/or differences in the experiences described are of interest, and could provide further insight as to the nature of those educational experience that have remained salient over the course of many years. That is to say that as the development of any theory unfolds additional, seemingly peripheral data sources such as historical documents discussing the status of public education at the time, could very well be used to further dissect the study’s findings and add to the formulation of theory (see Chapter 7 of [Glaser & Strauss](#), 1967).

1.4.3 Data Management

Throughout the interview process, audio recordings of (a.) field notes as recorded by the researcher, and (b.) the interviews themselves will be reviewed in an iterative process, focused on narrowing the focus of the study through the development of emergent themes. Reflections on this data will be documented in the form of notes and used to inform any modification(s) to the interview protocol, which would be noted in the final write-up. All audio recordings will be created using a Sony PCM-D50 audio recorder. Recordings will be collected in the .wav format and subsequently converted to the .mp4 format for storage in iTunes.

Relevant passages of audio will be transcribed using the NVivo software package.

In addition to utilizing a uniform naming system, an Extensis Portfolio database will be created to track all files. The primary benefit of utilizing this database approach is the ability to add metadata, or tags if you will, to the files. Much like the coding of the transcripts, the development of this system will be emergent in nature. Two backups of all files will be maintained daily, as a desktop, a laptop, and an external drive will be synchronized at the end of each day, a process which will be automated using ChronoSync software.

1.5 Analytic Processes

Data will be analyzed continuously, in an iterative, cyclical manner, drawing from the suggestions of grounded theory, i.e. the use of open, axial, and selective coding in a successive manner. This process is also referred to in the literature as the “constant comparative method” (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Initially, during the open coding portion of the analysis, the goal will be to “categorize and compare” data (Brown et al., 2002). Each time an incident is coded it will be compared with “previous incidents in the same and different groups coded in the same category” (Glaser & Strauss, 1967, p. 106). Categories will be either (a.) derived from the language used, or (b.) constructed by the researcher (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Properties of each category will be created. The derived speculative categories will also serve to inform decisions related to the pursuit of ancillary sources of data, in the same way that reflection during or after the interview process might initiate the same sort of revision.

Once the open coding process has reached a conclusion, as demonstrated by the saturation of categories, a shift to axial coding will occur. Axial coding entails the arrangement of codes into some sort of network which maintains parent-child and sibling-sibling relationships. Glaser and Strauss (1967) referred to this as the integration of categories and their properties. Additionally, it is required of the researcher to demonstrate the relationship or action represented by each connection within the network. An analog of this sort of analysis might be the propositional networks attributed to memory storage by some cognitive psychologists. Concisely, the research is charged with not only diagramming the relationships, but *explaining the nature* of the relationships (Brown et al., 2002).

The evolving theory will be delimited through what Glaser and Strauss (1967) coined as “reduction”, the goal of which is parsimony and readability. That is to say that the goal of the delimitation of a theory is to rid it of redundancy through the examination of extant categories, and to then rewrite the theory in a way that is comprehensible to the layman, in this case fellow researchers and educators. Relevant and related literature may be used to aid in this process as

well.

Finally, the search for an overarching, parsimonious theory will materialize from a discriminatory critique of the previously completed coding. While the axial coding will possess interpretive qualities, this final stage move further in this direction. Here, redundancy will be integrated and a major theme will be identified. The test of the quality of any produced theory is its ability to concisely summarize, while being founded upon, the data collected (Goulding, 1998). It is this measure against which any such produced theory will be judged.

1.6 Interpretations

The initial **interview** completed late in the process yielded few tangible results. However, the process was informative in that it confirmed a concern that I had developed from reading Spaniol, Madden, and Voss (2006). That is, the interviewee, my grandfather, found it essentially impossible to recall events that transpired during his high school years. Thus, this will affect the selection of participants in terms of the acceptable age ranges when moving from this preliminary work to a more rigorous study.

Secondly, it was rather difficult to keep the interview pointed in the direction that I desired. What began as an inquiry as to educational experiences morphed into a storytelling session, with jokes tossed in besides. The fact that I was interviewing my grandfather coupled with the semi-structured sans protocol strategy are, in my estimation, to blame. The question then, is whether or not to migrate to a more formal interview strategy. At this point I'm hesitant to do so. The key, I think, is to learn from what occurred, study the transcript, and then try again with a younger, unrelated individual. If this problem proves immutable, than a reevaluation will be in order.

1.7 Trustworthiness

Several conventions will be put into place in an attempt to rigorously question and examine the quality of the study. Member checking, or the invitation of interviewees to peruse transcripts and investigator generated conclusions in order to assess the degree of agreement will be employed on a continual process. It makes little sense to put this into practice near the end of a study, due to the recursive nature of grounded theory and the possibility of an inaccuracy being magnified through the iterative processes. Additionally, and as previously stated, it is likely that other sources of data, especially historical documents, will play a role corroborating evidence in the final analysis. Their use might be viewed as a form of triangulation. Trustworthiness will also be supported via a prolonged immersion in the field (Brown et al., 2002).

In the end, it is the evaluation of one's peers that ultimately determines the trustworthiness of a study. Unlike experimental studies which rely on established statistical calculations, qualitative endeavors are more subjective in nature. While all attempts will be made to ensure saturation of categories, as suggested by [Glaser and Strauss](#) (1967), it is the scholarly community that bears the brunt of the responsibility for assessing the relevance and power of a study. This work is initiated during the peer review process, and continues after publication through correspondence and the presentation of similar and antithetical work.

2 Log

Total Hours: **28.5 hours**

Much early work is not documented here, as it was required as part of the course and needed to participate in the discussions. As the course progressed, my understanding of the concepts evolved and the focus of my proposal changed. During the last two and one-half weeks I focused on grounded theory. I also completed one formal and one informal interview. Some of the readings that led to the purchasing of [Glaser and Strauss \(1967\)](#) were culled from the course materials. But, since these were read in addition to what was required, they were deemed worthy of inclusion.

- | | |
|---|-----------|
| I. July 15, 2008 | 1 hour |
| – Read, highlighted, and annotated Anderson and Shimizu (2007) | |
| II. July 16, 2008 | 1.5 hours |
| – Read, highlighted, and annotated Spaniol et al. (2006) | |
| III. July 20, 2008 | .5 hours |
| – Informal interview of cousin related to his instructional experiences, but as a teacher and as a student, in the Army | |
| IV. July 21, 2008 | 1.5 hours |
| – Read, highlighted, and annotated Creswell and Miller (2000) | |
| – Read, highlighted, and annotated Brown et al. (2002) | |
| V. July 23, 2008 | 2 hours |
| – Read, highlighted, and annotated chapters one and two from Glaser and Strauss (1967) | |
| VI. July 24, 2008 | 3 hours |
| – Read, highlighted, and annotated chapters three, four, and five from Glaser and Strauss (1967) | |
| VII. July 25, 2008 | 4 hours |
| – Read, highlighted, and annotated chapters six, seven, and eight from Glaser and Strauss (1967) | |
| – Formal interview of grandfather (1 hour) | |
| VIII. July 26, 2008 | 2 hours |

- Read, highlighted, and annotated chapters nine and ten from [Glaser and Strauss \(1967\)](#)
- IX. July 27, 2008 4.5 hours
- Read, highlighted, and annotated chapter eleven from [Glaser and Strauss \(1967\)](#)
 - Copied all highlights from text into new **searchable document** and quick reading, searching, and an easy to read overview (3.5 hours)
- X. July 29, 2008 2.5 hours
- **Transcribed** the first twenty-five minutes of the formal interview
- XI. July 30, 2008 2.5 hours
- **Transcribed** the next twenty-five minutes of the formal interview
- XII. July 31, 2008 1 hours
- **Transcribed** the last ten minutes of the formal interview
- XIII. August 2, 2008 2.5 hours
- Completion of IRB proposal and **consent forms**

3 Journal

3.1 June 14, 2008

Fairly late in chapter 7, [Ormrod](#) (2008) mentions the work of Dijksterhuis & Nordgren. I did some searching, and found a short summary of their work online. Their work is based on what they refer to as the “Unconscious Thought Theory”. The idea is that humans process information unconsciously, an idea that runs counter to the dual-store memory models which identify working memory, which itself is tied to the conscious, as the area in which processing occurs. In their studies, they investigate the differences in the decisions made by those individuals that consciously deliberate before making a decision, and those that do not. This is “crossed” with the complexity of the decision.

Their findings indicate that when tasks are relatively simple, conscious processing produces better, more satisfying results. Conversely, decisions that require the simultaneous rating, integration, and processing of multiple variables are better resolved by those individuals who do not consciously work towards a solution. Their experiments involved what I would refer to as a more traditional laboratory setting, in which participants were asked to make decisions about the renting of different apartments and the purchasing of automobiles (two different studies) as well as more informal survey of shoppers exiting two retail stores (furniture - more complex and expensive, department store - less complex and cheaper). Participants in the first two studies made “wiser” decisions when given a more complex set of data when this information was processed unconsciously. Similarly, shoppers reported being more satisfied with their purchases from the furniture store (after several weeks) when they reported making the decision to purchase the item spontaneously.

3.2 June 15, 2008

I don't see how “situating” one's self has great utility. I have found that generally, defining yourself in this way only serves to erect barriers to an overall flexibility that is helpful. This is not to say that I don't identify with specific conceptual ideas or philosophies derived or associated with various forms of research. But, as a whole I find it difficult to pin myself down as relating to either the qualitative or quantitative school of thought, let alone the descendent principals of each. Rather than choosing one side or another, I seek out the most advantageous application of each.

I found [Peshkin's](#) (1988) article agreeable, i.e., I was nodding my head as I read. But, the way in which he describes subjectivity, applying it equally to both qualitative and quantitative research, is a bit of a leap. I agree generally with his contention, that subjectivity exists in both domains, it is the *equally* that is problematic. To be fair, this isn't explicitly stated, rather it is implied. It seems to me

that often the scope of what's being examined has a lot to do with the degree of subjectivity. Small quantitative studies probably are probably less subjective than larger studies, and qualitative studies tend to be larger. However, [Howe](#) has added a bit to my thinking:

The differences between these two researchers turns on, or at least ought to turn on, what each is attempting to investigate and what assumptions each is willing to make. That is, the qualitative researcher (rightly or wrongly) is willing to assume relatively little, to keep the investigation open-ended and sensitive to unanticipated features of the object o of study. The qualitative researcher is also acutely sensitive to the particulars of the context, especially the descriptions and explanations of events supplied by actors involved. In contrast, the quantitative researcher (rightly or wrongly) is willing to assume much, e.g., that all confounding variables have been identified and that the variables of interest can be validly measured; quantitative researchers are also much less interested in actors points of view (1988).

I agree. Coming from a science background, a chemistry major as an undergraduate student, the scientific nature of quantitative research is appealing. But, the symmetry and orderliness that exists in the universe is far different from the intertwined behavior of human beings. And so now I have a classification for myself, actually two. I'm a "pragmatist" in the sense that I believe in using "what works" and I'm a "compatibilist" in that I fail to see the irreconcilability between the qualitative and quantitative approaches to studying human behavior. I'm now situated, still on the fence, but I've got a title.

3.3 June 17, 2008

I'm a little unsettled with regards to my choice of a qualitative study. I now realize, after class yesterday, that the vast majority of my reading has been in the quantitative arena. I'm not persuaded by arguments for or against either method, rather I find that my area of interest lends itself to quantitative work. My options are then to either (a.) pursue a study in a different area, most likely something relating to discipline in my school, or to (b.) look at my area of interest from a qualitative standpoint. The challenge, if I choose that latter, is that there isn't much that I've read to shape my perception as to what this type of work might look like, i.e., there are no examples. Nevertheless, my sense is that investigating my area of interest is more appropriate and, in the end, will be more helpful.

My area of interest is cognition, specifically cognitive load theory, motivation, and expertise. It is the last area in which I believe there might be room to do some qualitative work. Cognitive theory proposes that information exists within the brain as schemata, which might be described as "webs of knowledge". These

connections are activated by stimuli via the working memory, or more specifically, a “central executive”. The assumption of cognitivism is that experts possess fundamentally different schemata than non-experts. The question has been, “how do we measure this difference?” The fruits of this pursuit might inform the development of new instructional techniques. The problem with this line of research, however, is that one must make large assumptions at the onset because much of what is known is derived from the results of this expertise, not the underlying schemata.

The rationale for a qualitative study in this area would be to seek to understand the “mind” of an expert from his or her own perspective. The idea might be to have the expert discuss their expertise through some sort of “talking aloud” activity, i.e., to perform whatever expertise they possess while verbalizing their thought processes, and then comment on the procedure afterwards. In this way, we might be able to examine experts from a diverse collection of fields and then search for commonalities in the types of procedures and cognitive techniques employed. I find it a little unclear whether this would be classified as phenomenology or grounded theory, but my sense is that it would qualify as the former.

3.4 June 18, 2008

I really enjoyed the two articles that I read. As I’ve thought about what I might want type of research project I might want to pursue, I’ve been slightly confused by the gray areas between phenomenology and grounded theory. So, when I perused the articles for this week’s reading, I was happy to see at least one dedicated to each. For reference, the two articles that I read are listed below.

- Goulding, C. (1998). Grounded theory: The missing methodology on the interpretivist agenda. *Quantitative Market Research: An International Journal*, 1(1):50-57.
- Sanders, P. (1982). Phenomenology: A new way of viewing organizational research. *The Academy of Management Review*, 7(3):353-360.

I’ll now briefly address the former, as Mark Hogue has written a thorough review on the latter.

I found [Goulding](#) (1998) to be the more appealing of the two pieces. I especially like the historical perspective that was woven through the article, serving as a framework onto which components of the theory were attached. This chronology is the story of Glaser and Strauss who coauthored the initial work on grounded theory. The author explains how this work was essentially a radical departure from, and a challenge to, positivism. However, over time the two founders have grown apart. This chasm was exacerbated, and made visible to all, with the publishing of their competing works in the early 1990’s. The author indicates that

Strauss grew to believe that data (codes) should be assigned to (existing) categories, whereas Glaser was convinced that categories should be derived from observations and other forms of data as they emerge. Judging from their competing Wikipedia entries (not very scientific, I know), it looks as though Glaserian perspective has a more robust following.

My understanding of grounded theory is much better, though not complete, as a result of reading this article. One of the main underpinnings of Glaser and Strauss's original contribution was that there had been too much emphasis on the evaluation of theories, and not enough energy committed to the examination of the field or domain itself. The fruits of those analytical, contemplative efforts, they argued, would be the discovery of new areas of research. The author also identifies the mechanisms of grounded theory. Notably, that the consumption of *domain specific* literature is postponed until after some general ideas have been formed (culled) from the data. Rather, the researcher looks to other, unrelated fields for direction early on in the process.

As someone with a strong science background, I find the method, the underlying apparatus, attributed to grounded theory especially appealing. As someone with a messy desk and a cluttered home, I find the degree of constraint a little worrisome. At this, admittedly early, stage in my tutelage, I would say that the tenets of grounded theory could, and in many cases, should be applied to other qualitative methodologies. Data should lead to (increasingly broad) generalizations, and my sense is that this sort of induction is central to many qualitative methodologies. Of course, there are exceptions, some of which are described in this course (narratology and ethnography come to mind). Grounded theory is, as I perceive it, a bridge. A link between quantitative and qualitative research, allowing those of us steeped in positivist culture for much of our lives but who have come to question the assuredness, and yes arrogance, of some, to traverse into this new arena with a degree of confidence, derived from the structure of the theory itself. Some would say this is its greatest contribution.

3.5 June 19, 2008

Reply to Mark Hogue

I too read this article, and I share some of your conceptions as they relate to the qualitative form of research. I also see myself as a pragmatist, and thus believe that the tool must fit the problem. Further, I believe that specific problems call for certain tools. My question for you then, is whether or not you concur? Early on in your response, your offer praise for qualitative research in general, and seem to shun (to some degree) the quantitative side of things, at least in the case of educational research, as you state that your consideration of the topics in this course.

has brought to light the underlying frameworks which should inform the educational research community.

Which, as I read it, implies that there is no place for other methodologies. Personally, I see a place for both, as qualitative paints a more holistic and realistic portrait, but quantitative provides insight into the mechanical processes which lie beneath.

Also, as someone who also has a scientific background, I found the article on grounded theory to be helpful. You might as well, as the structure of this methodology might be appealing, and it provides the framework upon which you can build an inductive sort of study.

Reply to Brian Friedt

I should first make it clear that I did not read the article. But, the discussion over this quotation is interesting, so I guess I'll jump in. Again, the quote as stated on this board is

logic dictates that if a researcher is to empathise with those being researched then it follows that their life history must be as near as possible to that of the people being studied; women researchers are better placed to do research on women, and people with impairments are best equipped to research disability.

I find one of the most intriguing differences between qualitative and quantitative research the degree to which the *skill of the researcher* comes into play. The qualitative researcher is the research instrument, data is identified in the field, collected, and perceived through the eyes of this individual. And so, the skill, the intent, and yes, the experiences of the researcher **all matter**.

One's interpretation of this quotation probably depends on how one quantifies (no pun intended) "good research". The answer to which might be rooted in one's response to another, more simple question.

Is insight of greater importance than objectivity?

Personally, I think we need both. I understand what the author is saying, but without objectivity, without personally striving to question ourselves, only our subjectivity would remain.

3.6 June 20, 2008

Throughout my experience here at Kent State, I'm continuously struck by how much about learning I either (a.) don't remember, or (b.) was never taught as

I worked my way up to this point in my schooling. I'm appalled that "learning techniques" are not a consistent focus in our schools. There's so much to know in terms of what types of strategies are effective and what types are not. I would even argue that building a high school course around a book like the one for this course would have dramatic effects in the remaining educational lives of those exposed. I'd also be willing to bet that the type of information contained in this book would be appealing to students in that the potential benefits are immediately apparent, better performance.

As an aside, there's a passage in the book *Blink* (Gladwell, 2005) that discusses the role of the unconscious in determining performance. He cites a study that "primed" half of the participants by asking them to think about, and then write down, what it would be like to be a professor. The other half were asked to follow the same procedures but their topic of focus was soccer hooligans. The first group got a little over 55% of the questions right. The second group scored 13% lower. The author implies that these groups were randomized and thus the assumption is that they were of equal ability. He then raises the question as to whether or not discrepancies students performance on standardized tests, or any tests for that matter, could be due to environmental cues, e.g., students in more affluent areas are constantly "primed" to do well, while students in more urban areas may be "primed" to fail.

He also mentions a second, similar study in which merely asking 20 black participants to indicate their race on a questionnaire resulted in a decrease by half in the number of correct answer on the twenty question selected from the GRE.

Pretty powerful stuff.

3.7 June 21, 2008

I just finished reading a wonderful article (Ericsson, Roring, & Nandagopal, 2007) on expertise. The authors present a convincing case as to why "deliberate practice" is the primary indicator of whether or not an individual achieves a high level of expertise. They note two exceptions, height and body mass, which they relate to athletics (one assumes basketball and football). Their rationale, considering the research they use to support their argument is persuasive, and in a fate versus free will type of way, uplifting.

After reading the words "deliberate practice" several times, I was struck by the similarity between the descriptions of these actions, and the discussion of germane cognitive load (Sweller, Merrienboer, & Paas, 1998; Kalyuga, Ayres, Chandler, & Sweller, 2003). There is, I think, a connection here, in that in both cases the learner is committed and pushed. That is to say that they're applying them-

selves fully, and that the task at hand is challenging.

3.8 June 23, 2008

I just finished listening to *Blink: The Power of Thinking Without Thinking*, a book by Malcomb Gladwell. This book is about rapid cognition and how accurate our instinctive responses can be. Some of the examples that Caldwell uses are related to race. One striking example of the power of the unconscious is an experiment he cites in which half of the randomly assigned participants, all African Americans, were asked to indicate their race prior to answering 20 questions from the GRE. The group of participants who were required to do so scored, on average, half as well as the control group. Evidence, Caldwell contends, that even African American's perception of African Americans can be so negative as to adversely effect their performance, as indicated by the lower scores.

Later, Caldwell describes The Implicit Association Test (IAT), which tests individual's instinctive association between pairs of words or images. In its most famous form, it assesses people's underlying racial prejudices. You can take the test your self here <https://implicit.harvard.edu/implicit/>. You'll have to click through a couple screens and then choose the "Race IAT". I've just finished taking it myself, and the summary page states the following.

- 27% of respondents have a strong automatic preference for White people
- 27% of respondents have a moderate automatic preference for White people
- 16% of respondents have a slight automatic preference for White people
- 17% of respondents have a no automatic preference between Black people and White people
- 6% of respondents have a slight automatic preference for Black people
- 4% of respondents have a moderate automatic preference for Black people
- 2% of respondents have a strong automatic preference for Black people

Blink served as a prism through which I read *Capitalizing on Change: The Discursive Framing of Diversity in U.S. Land-Grant Universities* (Iverson, 2008). Discursive analyses of 21 "diversity action plans" from 20 universities served as the basis of the study. Essentially, Dr. Iverson performed a disciplined, methodical, word-by-word dissection of the language used in these documents. Data was the massaged, and over the course of many iterations four central themes emerged, marketplace, excellence, managerialism, and democracy. The first three play a more dominant role, and combine to depict the minority student, or more generally diversity, as a commodity (p. 185). Democracy serves to counter this triad,

but in the end is plagued by the tendency to consolidate power.

I wonder, though, if there is a way to synthesize these findings differently. As I see it, there is an underlying *rationale* paired with corresponding *strategies* needed to bring about the desired end state, a diverse campus atmosphere. And, I would argue, underlying all of this is the concession that racism is an impediment *and* an acknowledgement that what should be intrinsically motivating (diversity) can only be brought about through extrinsic (monetary) reinforcement. Why else would this manifestation of diversity as commodity arise rather than ideals such as raising the national discourse and creating a more perfect union?

Why isn't the underlying, pervasive, negative association with race, indicated by the results of the IAT and prominent in our communities, a worthy justification for diversity? The results of the Race IAT crystalize the need for this approach. The authors of these policies, I posit, have little faith in the ability of this rationale to cause change. They don't believe that their staffs will view this, less tangible, reasoning as motivating. Rather, they choose minority student as product (viewing students as products is not unique to university's pursuit of minorities) and resort to top-down business strategies (issuing ultimatums) and high pressure sales techniques in their quest for minority students (p. 189).

I really enjoyed the article, as it effectively *made the familiar unfamiliar*, and is in my estimation, a success. In fact, I mentioned it to a student in another one of my classes, as he works for Kent State in this area. I hope that others like him take the time to read and reflect on the article as well.

Reply to Mark Hogue

For me, this is the money quote

Cultural norms set the stage for sexual abuse...In relation to childhood sexual abuse, an examination of social forces helps to shift the focus of coping from a purely individual analysis to an individual-in-context analysis, thereby normalizing the victim's experience and reducing self-blame (p. 303).

I was also a bit taken aback with the subject matter. In point of fact, the topic is exceedingly relevant and of great importance to society. Hence, my selection of the afore mentioned quotation. Having no prior experience even reading about this topic, I can only speculate. But, it seems to me that "normalizing the victim's experience and reducing self-blame" is something that would need to occur early on if a therapist hopes to convince the victim to press onward and for any sort of healing to transpire. This shift in the victim's thinking is kindling, if you will, a catalyst for the healing process. And, in my estimation, it is the primary contribution of this study.

Reply to Brian Friedt

I think you've nailed it with the following two comments.

While the author doesn't say it directly, this seems to me to be about paying attention to the right things.

and

One of the main thrusts of the piece seems to be that people with disabilities ought to be viewed as people rather than diagnoses.

This is what I took away from the piece as well. Moreover, there's a bit that can be said about Angorsino's subjectivity here too, I think. The author's arrival at this judgment corresponds with a re-assignment of Vonnie Lee from the category of "mental retardation" to the category of "person". Angorsino's initial designation of Vonnie as "retarded" indicates his subjectivity. Further, the pre-eminent "right thing" on which to focus is *the person*. Of course, people make split-second decisions based on underlying biases all the time (see my response to Dr. Iverson's piece if you're interested), and so one might argue that seeing people "as people" regardless of their appearance or label is a challenge in and of itself.

3.9 June 26, 2008

Maxine Greene's piece ([Greene, 1994](#)) is one of the more challenging essays, in terms of verbosity and ideas, that I've read. Typically, when I consume something this dense, I spend a day or two away from it before I once more review the contents and begin to pull together something that resembles coherent thought. I have done so with this piece. I take a risk here, as it would be safer to acquiesce, but I cannot.

So much of what the author advances resonates, as she meanders through history, tracing philosophical approaches to knowledge, and its pursuit. I subscribe to her underlying postulate regarding the nature of "truth", specifically the interpretability and relative nature of truth. Moreover, the way in which Greene elucidates these intrinsic qualities, citing the preeminent philosophers of the past, is particularly helpful. Finally, the way in which she, after what I describe below as a bit of a diatribe, comes back to the terms "imagination" and "metaphor", relieves a modicum of tension. More importantly, this return to the center also provides the reader with some direction in terms of what might be a way to bridge the divide the author seems set on exacerbating throughout much of this work.

In the end however, I'm left feeling empty and cold, as the piece's ostensible rationale, a review of the influence of recent approaches to knowledge, submits

to an tacit partisan attack on positivism and those who are open to its tenets. It is only in the last several pages that the author relents, searching for commonality and commensurability in the promise of imagination and the metaphor. It is as if I've been dropped into the middle of an epic battle, both sides having dug in and opened up their armaments upon one another. Philosophical arguments, infused with erudite language considering each constituent element in it's minutia, is the weaponry of choice. Most striking of all is the fact that there are no concessions embedded in this treatise, no acknowledgement of a single contribution from the vast array of positivist studies. And, I'm left to wonder why.

Furthermore, rather than adopting a holistic approach to the stated topic, the author succumbs to framing each successive proposition in terms of feminism. This first appears on page 427, and then begins in earnest six pages later. It is as if Greene has married positivism and males, postmodernism and females, and placed these dyads on opposite sides of an ever-widening chasm, never to commingle again. One might argue that this reflects Greene's "situation", or the way in which she perceives the world. In fact, this is most likely the case. However, the prominent role of feminism weakens her argument as a whole, especially as the title foretells a more general review of epistemology and its relation to educational research. Lastly, it is a bit ironic that the author portrays her adversaries as aristocratic, yet employs an elitist tone in her writing.

It is not merely this article that has left residual bitterness. More precisely, it is the sense that criticisms such as this one proliferate on both sides, that they consume those of the highest intellect in each camp, and this exercise serves as little more than sport. That is to say, their existence serves no purpose, and instead drains the very resources needed to facilitate further understanding, be it objective or subjective. My interpretation could, of course, be all wrong. That is, unless one endorses Greene's hypotheses unconditionally, in which case my interpretation is *relative* and *situated*, and thus impregnable.

3.10 June 30, 2008

Isn't motivation a key component of self-regulated learning? It seems to me that an individual's motivation to learn some topic is of the greatest concern, more so than the listed qualities of those who self-regulate. That is, if one is unmotivated to learn, than there is no reason to regulate one's learning, the material is not important enough to warrant the effort. The text addresses the idea of motivation briefly, stating that self-regulated learners

[maintain] motivation to complete a learning task ([Ormrod](#), 2008, p.355).

However, this has more to do with one's behavior, possibly using what Vygotsky referred to as inner speech to give oneself a "pep talk". I'm alluding to the

motivation intrinsically derived from the content itself. In another post, Annette mentions that her students study “to complete an assignment” and “not ... to learn”. Isn’t the unappealing nature of the material one likely reason why Annette’s students (and mine as well) employ these elementary strategies?

3.11 July 3, 2008

“Functional fixedness” is defined as the inability to view the familiar in novel ways (Bruning, Schraw, Norby, & Ronning, 2004). That is, as we become more familiar, we inevitably lose (at least some of) our ability to perceive situations and events out of that established context. I’ve often wondered about whether or not consuming literature related to a field of interest is actually beneficial for this reason. Once read and assimilated, the contentions of existing research will have shaped a researcher’s understanding of the idea. That individual’s thoughts about the topic and possible solutions will be viewed through this manufactured prism, which might obstruct their ability to pursue solutions and/or modification in procedures outside the context of what has been done in the past, or at least the studies that they’ve read. I find it interesting that grounded theory, as described by Goulding (1998, p. 53) proscribes the following approach.

Comparable works are not consulted in order to avoid internalising the perspectives and hypotheses of scholars in the immediate field of study. However, once the theory is developed, such related work is analysed in order to draw comparisons, build on, or offer an alternative perspective.

It appears that there might be some concern related to preconceptions that serve as a basis for this advice. The readings (Creswell, 2006; Marshall, 1996) for today have brought me to the idea of functional fixedness once again. One might argue that there is a relationship between subjectivity and functional fixedness, in that they are both related to the way one perceives a situation. This is a fair comparison, yet I think there is a discernible difference. My understanding is that subjectivity has more to do with personal feelings and beliefs, whereas functional fixedness is more closely associated with how one processes stimuli. And it is this processing of one’s environment (stimuli) that I think is related to the sometimes employed inductive, iterative processes of selecting participants (sampling).

Both Creswell (2006, p. 126) and Marshall (1996, p. 523) discusses how the identity of participants can evolve throughout the course of a study. And while I generally agree that this is advantageous, and seems necessary, isn’t there a possibility that emergence in the field necessarily alters the researcher’s way of perceiving the environment? To be clear, the inductive nature of qualitative research is something I find most appealing. However, it seems to me that once

one enters the field, their perceptions are sure to change rather quickly, and decisions made post-emergence are certain to be influenced by this shift. Purposeful sampling, as described in the text, seems to be designed, in part, to avoid this type of dilemma. Specifically, [Creswell](#) (2006, p. 125) states that purposeful sampling involves

- who or what should be sampled
- what form the sampling will take
- how many people or sites need to be sampled, and
- decisions regarding the consistency of sampling as it relates to the method of inquiry

Furthermore, preexisting sampling methods such as those [Creswell](#) (2006, p. 127) listed provide frameworks against which researchers can evaluate possible participants and sites when embarking upon a study. Nevertheless, qualitative research allows for the reassessment of sampling choices as the study is shaped over time. Thus, there is a very real possibility of having to refine one's sample while the study is in its early stages. I would be interested to hear what others think regarding the possibility of becoming "functionally fixed" once in the field and subsequently having to reevaluate potential subjects of study.

Reply to Brian Friedt

At the end of your post, you state:

Further, in SSD, the concept is that knowledge accretes slowly, through multiple studies examining similar issues over a significant period of time. While it's not addressed explicitly in the Marshall piece, this seems to hit on the idea of transferability a little bit as well.

As I continue to read, especially in this class, I'm gaining a more complete understanding of how various "camps" view research in general. I've always had a preexisting notion that there is "no right way" to conduct research, and that no study presents the entire picture. This is why I find what you've stated here, the idea embedded within SSD that "knowledge accretes slowly", so appealing. Could it be any other way? Doesn't the release of each new study, regardless of whether it is qualitative or quantitative in nature, add color and texture to the canvas, so that each time we look at the picture being created we see something different than we've previously observed? And shouldn't the complexity of this reality be appreciated rather than dismissed?

Reply to Kendra Mt Castle

I think there might be an easier, simpler way to generate a sample. It seems to me that merchants know an awful lot about who shops at their stores, in terms of demographics and socioeconomic status. What about using extreme case sampling, based on this type of data. For example, you might look at individuals from lower economic status and individuals of high economic status. Of course, it would be nice if you could certify certain assumptions by gaining access to merchant data.

You might be able to achieve extreme sampling by targeting specific areas of a city, or by looking at areas that have just been developed contrasted with areas in which the retail market is on the decline. On the other hand, I do my shopping online (another potential group), so what do I know?

Reply to Mark Hogue

You've summarized the article well, so I won't add much. However, I wanted to make two points and then address the story from the end of your piece. [Sixsmith and Murray](#) (2001, p. 426) state

Second, the notion of privacy can also hinge upon the nature of the email group. Herring (1996) argues that CMC can be seen as both published (and therefore public) and private material at different times and in different places.

This different time and different places idea brought up a new feature that I've been seeing from time to time on some of the forums I end up visiting (for whatever reason), personal messaging. How would a researcher go about determining what is "public" and what is "private" when the forum has a feature for the sole purpose of communicating privately? Does this make all other forms of communication public by default? Secondly, the authors cite Gilbert (1997), observing that

... CMC provides a space of social action that although discursive, has a phenomenological reality (p. 428).

My only point here would be researching the nature of CMC would seem to be a fruitful pursuit, although the authors' mention of social presence theory (p. 427) indicates that work here has been the focus of researchers for many years.

Lastly, I'd like to address the question you leave us with at the end of your post. Maybe I'm being a little dense here, but I fail to see the underlying motivation for the committee chair's dismissal of your friends request. The points made by the authors of the study deal explicitly with individuals who are unaware of research being conducted, those who have not given consent. In your friend's case, I would assume that he had procured consent early in the process, thus those

concerns would be unfounded. Your friend, I think, was correct. I'd be interested to know the committee chair's stance on technology in general, as I sense that this might be the real impetus for his rebuke. The only tangential possibility would be the digital copy of the information stored on a server somewhere. However, all mail clients (that I know of) allow the individual to store the messages on their local machine rather than the server. So, I left a little confused. Maybe there's an argument to make about hearing intonation changes and taking away something from those inflections, but I'm reaching here.

3.12 July 8, 2008

On Monday two guest researchers (professors from Kent State) discussed their research. And, at various points they solicited questions from our class, many of which were process related. It was apparent that these individuals' experience with doctoral students has not always supported these suppositions. Over the course of an 1.5 hours, they stressed that

- the process is “not easy”
- candidates show up “prepared”
- candidates cultivate good relationships with their committee, and
- committee members are not there to do the work for candidates.

It seems to me that these sort of comments indicate that at least some doctoral students select performance goals rather than the more preferable mastery goals and that their motivation is derived from extrinsic sources instead of a “need to know”. I find this pretty interesting.

3.13 July 9, 2008

[LaBoskey](#) (2007) provides the reader a concise and coherent summary of self-study, an inner-directed, interactive form of research focused on improvement of self as it relates to education. The goals of this type of research are founded in the goal of enrolling both colleagues and students in the endeavor, as they serve as critic and pupil. The author emphasizes the ways in which self-study differs from reflective practice, conceding that the precepts of the latter can be found in the former, yet pointing to self-study's inclusion of other viewpoints and a bias towards divergent rather than convergent outcomes. That is to say that those indoctrinated in this methodology tend to actively avoid closure, or settlement and choose instead, to continuously transform themselves as educators and professionals.

This active appeal for what Piaget would call “disequilibrium” or what is now sometimes referred to as “cognitive dissonance” is, in my opinion, healthy. I've

found that those I've met who've yet to settle are the ones with a purpose. Conversely, those who do, who surrender to the appeal of the boons of society lose a something recognizable to those who have not. As John Dewey said,

Good consists in the meaning experienced ... when conflict and entanglement of various incompatible impulses and habits terminate in a unified orderly release in action (Dewey, J. as cited in [Hostetler, Macintyre Latta, & Sarroub](#), 2007, p. 231).

Dewey's "good" is recognizable, and it is this good that self-study seeks to generate through the challenging of oneself. LeBoskey's rationale is rooted in the idea that we are all bound by cultural perspectives and history, and that we need the contributions of others, who have disparate views, perspectives, and histories of their own. There is something fundamental about this approach, beyond the scholarship or length of the piece; the idea that *teachers can learn from their students*. This is profound, only because it is so plainly clear yet beyond the limits of ego for many. [Rogoff](#) (1991, p. 39) asserts

The "master," or expert, is relatively more skilled than the novices, with a broader vision of the important features of the culturally valued activity. However, the expert too is still developing breadth and depth of skill and understanding in the process of carrying out the activity and guiding others in it. Hence the model provided by apprenticeship is one of active learners in a community of people who support, challenge, and guide novices as they increasingly participate in skilled, valued sociocultural activity.

Lastly, the author stresses the need for balance, as it is to be noted that they are acting as both researcher and teacher, and thus both roles must be attended to equally. My sense is that the mindset of presented in the piece, and the strategies employed as described, would render consideration of this possibility unnecessary unless the tenets were being implemented incorrectly or mistakenly interpreted. I have covered only a bit of the content in LeBoskey's work, but I must say that it is worthy of other's review, and my choice of content to cover signals why. The ability to be critical of oneself, to hear, digest, and act upon other's criticism, and to understand the benefits of creating more equitable classroom environments are notions that more (teacher) educators need to hear.

3.14 July 11, 2008

I've thought for a while now that the one thing that is relatively easy for teachers to implement in the classroom is autonomy. As the author states, the choices provided to students must be real, rather than trivial. However, it seems to me that like other more atypical techniques, providing student with legitimate choices is more a product of good planning than anything else. That is to say that

it would require, as far as I can tell, working backwards from an instructional objective more than once, creating one learning activity per iteration. Another option would be to tweak a single instructional technique, providing options (branches) as students work. In any case, as I've previously stated, these types of instructional designs are more labor intensive.

On the other hand, incorporating autonomy in more subtle ways can be done with little effort. For example, I often asked students for their preference as to classroom procedures. Would they rather review as a class, then take an informal quiz for practice, or would they rather quiz each other than take the informal quiz? This technique, where the teacher knows the end state but provides students with choices as to what path to take is much easier than the aforementioned provision of multiple learning experiences, which essentially equates with the creation of various lesson plans per instructional objective.

3.15 July 15, 2008

[Aguinaldo](#) (2004) provides the reader with an alternative and useful interpretation of, and prescription for, judging validity. He encapsulates his argument nicely in concluding

The goal of validation is not to determine, once and for all, if a representation serves a particular function, but rather to discover and anticipate how it “does,” “can,” or “might,” function to incite and foreclose, emancipate and oppress, and so forth when applied to different times and contexts and evaluated from different social locations ([Aguinaldo](#), 2004, p. 134).

Further, [Aguinaldo](#) provides the reader with some context, using the example of his own work on the abusive relationships extant in the community of gay men. Specifically, his focus is founded on four narrative strands that run through his work,

- a realist narrative premised on an objective perspective
- a critical narrative focused on political entities and injustice
- a deconstructive narrative which actively seeks disequilibrium and the “proliferation of possibilities”, and
- a reflexive narrative which makes known to the reader the intentions and subjectivity of the researcher.

The analysis is very good, and appealing. What I find disconcerting is the degree to which language plays a central role in the research process. I've been unable to purge the memory of Dr. Gershon emphatically pronouncing the importance

of language, that “words matter”, over and over again as he spoke to us recently. I thought it was *ideas* that matter. And, of course they do, but this brings me to the second, maybe more profound role of language, as a tool of persuasion. To the point; how much time do researchers spend arguing over the use of language? Truth or interpretation, validity or trustworthiness? Are the greatest researchers those who write in the most convincing way? Are their words more enticing?

These questions aren’t necessarily derived from Aguinaldo’s piece. His argument is more about process. But, a the rich process which he suggests should be utilized for the administration and evaluation of qualitative research is, in part, dependent on expansive prose. Rather than simply reporting the results of a study in a straightforward and linear fashion, authors are to weave four narrative strands seamlessly throughout their transcript, in a way that is easy to follow. This is not an simple task, as it requires a measure of persistence and skill not typically found in any but the most passionate of individuals. Again, this is not to say that I disagree, but it serves to illustrate the fundamental role that language plays in the realm of scholarly qualitative research.

3.16 July 16, 2008

I’m attending the Building Learning Communities 2008 conference for the next couple of days. Ewan McIntosh kicked off the event with his keynote address this morning. I found his presentation was useful in that it initiated a change in they way I look at my use of technology as a personal tool. Specifically, to this point I have shunned the use of popular sites such as Twitter, del.icio.us, and social networking sites such as Facebook. The reason? I have software that allows me to do the same sort of things on my own using my own web space.

And, suddenly I feel out of place, as though I’ve been complacent in using these tools for too long and I’ve not got work to do immersing myself in this new way of sharing this information. That is to say that I haven’t been *participating* or *sharing*, but *documenting*. The great lesson I take away from this experience is that there is no down time, there is only the continual assimilation and accommodation of new information, new technologies, and the ways in which they are utilized by the younger generations.

3.17 July 17, 2008

There is a distinct quality of the presenters at BLC, in that there is a progressive bent to most of what they do. It’s refreshing, but also slightly depressing as it seems that in order to make the points that they’ve been making, principally the idea of creating school environments and pedagogy focused on the cultivating of global building learning communities, they’ve had to put aside the problematic

nature of legal and societal issues facing the administrators and school board members who would be charged with initiating, or at a minimum endorsing any requisite policy changes.

Two of the sessions I visited today were presented by Mark Prensky, the first entitled “The Death of the Classroom and the Rebirth of Learning in the 21st Century: How Technology Changes the Meaning of Teaching”, and the second “The True 21st Century Literacy is Programming: What We Should Be Teaching Our Kids and How To Do It”. They were both excellent, but some of what he says would be considered controversial by the masses. He questions the need for teaching written language, especially cursive. Why are we teaching long division when we have machines that can do these types of operations for us? Why aren't we focusing on skills such as programming and the sharing of culture that he suggests are required.

Central to Mark's argument, I think, are two contentions. First, the predicted exponential growth in the use and capacity of technology, which has just begun, renders the traditional classroom and pedagogy obsolete. And secondly, if we resist this reality and continue to teach the content that we've always taught using methodologies that we've always used, that we are essentially teaching backwards. That is to say that we are preparing our young people for the possibility of some sort of event that cripples the technological infrastructure that exists and is continuously expanded. Further, and most profound, is the question of what an adoption of this backward approach would say about us and our confidence in our own society.

3.18 July 19, 2008

I came away from BLC 2008 with two notions of interest. One applies to procedural or systematic change and the other is more personal in nature. As I've stated in my previous posts, it seems that the presenters at this conference were a more progressive bunch as a whole, compared to those that I saw at ETech. It was also my sense that the overall level of knowledge was a little higher, and in general, the content was more theoretical in nature. My first take away is the idea that incremental change can be harmful. This wasn't explicitly stated by any of the presenters, rather it sort of emerged from a synthesis of their disparate presentations. It seems that one of themes running through what I saw was the idea that technology should be viewed as a tool or a support for a new paradigm, new pedagogy if you will. My summation is that incremental change lends itself to assimilation and/or accommodation rather than transformation. That is to say that if we try to change our school “one step at a time” we may well end up with teachers using new technology as a replacement for old technology. More profound is the notion that at the end of this process we will have lost an opportunity to create real change. I think if you look at school reforms of the

day, and the ways in which most new technology is used, you will find data that supports this postulate.

The second, more personal idea that I've taken from the conference is that there is a fundamental *need to be bold*. In a way, this ties into the above mentioned idea of transformational, big, shocking change (a bold initiative) instead of the ubiquitous incremental change. I suppose one could go about changing oneself in this was as well. For instance, it would be interesting to look at the relative effectiveness of different interventions for addiction (and I'd bet this exists, but I'm too lazy to look it up right now). Could demanding greater lifestyle changes in an addicts life be more effective than a more deliberate approach? The most impressive presenters, Ewen McIntosh, John Davitt and Mark Prensky have all pushed thee limits in some way. They've been bold, they have not conformed and their perspective is now valued by the collective community. Schools that are bold in their policy decisions are noticed as well.

For me, these were the benefits of BLC 2008. It's appropriate, I think, that they are conceptual in nature, rather than procedural (some might use the word practical here, but I will not). These two ideas, instigating change in big, startling ways, and adopting an overall boldness in the way we perceive and make decisions or choose projects are likely to stay with me for a long while. In that way, BLC 2008 has been encouraging and possibly (we will see...), transformational.

3.19 July 20, 2008

Reply to Mark Hogue

I'm glad I read your response, as it prompted me to read [Creswell and Miller \(2000\)](#) as well. I think you've made some good points, although I'm not sure I would've used the exact wording you've employed. I agree that there's some incongruity within the article. This is especially apparent near the end when the authors talk about their position within the continuum, stating that they most closely align with the post-positivist approach, but then going on to discuss the importance of reflexivity and the views of the participants. In the end, it seems as though people generally don't fall neatly into one of these three described paradigms.

What I've long thought, and what has become apparent palpable as this course has progressed, is that the degree to which a qualitative study is considered "valid" is democratically determined. This is to say that it is the collective intelligence and wisdom of the community that ultimately decides whether or not a paper and the results within merit citation and further consideration.

Reply to Larissa Malone

You quote Aguinaldo as he states

It is not uncommon for qualitative researchers to shirk the issue of validity in their research write-ups. I have done so in my own work, not to evade the issue necessarily, but as a mean to dodge the long and extraordinarily tiresome tasks of unpacking positivist assumptions to which my own notion of validity runs contrary.

I wonder how much this “issue” arises *because* qualitative researchers don’t necessarily believe in validity, or that it is an issue. I one doesn’t believe that providing generalization is possible, does validity become trivial? I too found Aguinaldo’s description of “validity” appealing.

As an aside, I find it odd that much of quantitative research has moved from the behaviorist perspective to a social cognitive perspective while the quantitative methodologies that they employ often treat individuals as organisms rather than unique entities, which is sort of ironic.

3.20 July 21, 2008

’s [Anderson and Shimizu](#) (2007) work related to what and why people remember of events from long ago serves as an appropriate introduction to my review of literature. I found the identification of affect, agenda fulfillment, and rehearsal as the three contributing factors to long-term retention useful as well. My concern is how these factors might manifest themselves in the classroom. The authors note that rehearsal tends to be the most significant of the three, when put into use by an individual. It would seem that this type of behavior would only occur in motivated individuals, e.g., those who are interested in learning the material for some reason.

The role of affect and agenda fulfillment are more diffuse. It would appear that much of the role that these factors play would be tied to events and characteristics of individuals that lie outside the walls of the classroom. It could be argued that the origin of stimuli leading to affect and agenda fulfillment are random nature, and thus unknowable to the teachers who set the learning environment and dictate events that transpire throughout the course of the school year. Therefore, the attributions made by participants in a study focused on classroom learning from long ago would be of particular interest. Are they related to expectations set within the classroom or those innately possessed by the individual? Were affects related to the instruction, assessment, or evaluation of peers?

3.21 July 22, 2008

I found the work of [Spaniol et al.](#) (2006) to be overly complex and too specific for personal use. I struggled through this article, as a lot of what was cited early

on would have required additional reading for clarification. What was interesting, and helpful as it relates to the proposed study was the idea that contextual memory retrieval tends to decrease with age. And, as the authors state “Episodic recognition tasks rely explicitly on context memory, by requiring the discrimination between events experienced in the context of an experimental study phase and events experienced extraexperimentally” (Spaniol et al., 2006, p. 101). And so, this is significant as I work with choosing participants. Should I choose from a broad range of ages? Is there an idea age that maximizes the temporal space while minimizing any cognitive deficiencies? Will I be able to identify situations where participant’s contextual memories are contributing disproportionately to one’s inability to recall information?

3.22 July 25, 2008

’s [Brown et al.](#) (2002) article provided the impetus to purchase [Glaser and Strauss](#) (1967). I had previously read, as a requirement, [Goulding](#) (1998) which originally peaked my interest in grounded theory. After progressing through the majority of the course, I know that I need to gain a more fundamental understanding of this methodology. I also have a fear of “corrupting” my understanding of the theory via the consumption of other interpretive pieces on the subject. In fact, it was the citation of Strauss and Corbin in this article that led me to Amazon’s web page. This is a nice article, and in a way it confirmed my interest in the methodology. But more than anything, it firmed my belief that I would need to, as Walter Gershon said when he spoke to us earlier, go to the original source. My plan, then, is to read the original piece on grounded theory, and to leave it at that. Which is to say that I’d rather not read other’s interpretations, or even *the original authors’ later interpretations or clarifications*. My goal is to, from this point on, refer only to the original source. In this way, any interpretation will be my own.

3.23 July 28, 2008

I very much enjoyed reading [Glaser and Strauss](#) (1967). I found the text very liberating. It seems as the authors have turned the world on its head a bit, pushing back against the positivist sense of validity and the traditionally understood notion of systematic inquiry. The push against positivism was not as significant (for me) as the alternative form of systematic investigation provided. My history has been in the sciences, so I understand quite well the characteristics of the scientific method. The question that needs to be answered is whether or not the application of the scientific method to the interactions of organisms as complex as human beings is practical. My sense is that there is a consensus that is starting to build, as more and more people are coalesce around this idea that researchers “use the method that fits”.

[Glaser and Strauss](#) (1967) goes further. One of the best points the authors make is related to the phenomena of researchers coming upon data within the course of the study that they *chose to ignore* because it runs contrary to their predetermined experimental design, or provides insight, that while interesting, fall outside the bounds of the study's charter. This is just silly, they say. And, I tend to agree. What is the benefit of sticking with a tree that is bearing no fruit? The way in which the authors describe inquiry is exciting, as if you are on a quest, all sorts of possibilities exist and all forms of data are available for consumption. I've compiled a [list of quotations](#) from the text, which is nice in that it allows me to quickly scan and/or search what I considered noteworthy as I read.

4 Excerpts from: *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research* by Barney G. Glaser and Anselm L. Strauss

4.1 Chapter 1: The Discovery of Grounded Theory

For many sociologists, however, undoubtedly there exists a conflict concerning primacy of purpose, reflecting the opposition between a desire to generate theory and a trained need to verify it (p. 2).

We also believe that other canons for assessing a theory, such as logical consistency, clarity, parsimony, density, scope, integration, as well as its fit and its ability to work, are also significantly dependent on how the theory was generated (p. 3).

Generating a theory from data means that most hypotheses and concepts not only come from the data, but are systematically worked out in relation to the data during the course of research (p. 4).

What clash there is concerns the primacy of emphasis on verification or generation of theory — to which heated discussions on qualitative versus quantitative have been linked historically. We believe that each form of data is useful for both verification and generation of theory (p. 17).

In many instances, both forms are necessary — not quantitative used to test qualitative, but both used as supplements, as mutual verification and, most important for us, as different forms of data on the same subject, which, when compared, will each generate theory (p. 18).

4.2 Chapter 2: Grounded Theory

In discovering theory, one generates conceptual categories, or their properties from evidence, then the evidence from which the category emerged is used to illustrate the concept (p. 23).

In short, the discovered theoretical category lives on until proven theoretically defunct for any class of data, while the life of accurate evidence that indicated the category may be short (p. 24).

The researchers in specific studies do not seem to have focused directly on how their theory emerged; as a result, they have not explored how they could have generated more of it more systematically, and with more conceptual generality and scope. A focus on testing can thus easily block the generation of a more rounded and more dense theory (p. 27).

The generation of theory through comparative analysis both subsumes and assumes verifications and accurate descriptions, but only to the extent that the latter are in the service of generation. Otherwise they are sure to stifle it.

This situation is in contrast to the risk of testing a logico-deductive theory, which is dubiously related to the area of behavior it purports to explain, since it is merely thought up on the basis of *a priori* assumption and a touch of common sense, peppered with a few old theoretical speculations made by the erudite (p. 29).

Indeed, the market, corporate, and government fact-finding agencies can easily outdo any sociologist in researched descriptions through sheer resources, if the care to. Where the sociologist can help these agencies is by providing them with theory that will make their research relevant (p. 31).

Our strategy of comparative analysis for generating theory puts a high emphasis on *theory as process*; that is, theory as an ever-developing entity, not a perfect product (p. 32).

Our approach, allowing substantive concepts and hypotheses to emerge first, on their own, enables the analyst to ascertain which, if any, formal theory may help him generate his substantive theories. He can then be more faithful to his data, rather than forcing it to fit a theory. He can be more objective and less theoretically biased. Of course, this also means that he cannot merely apply Parsonian or Mertonian categories at the start, but must wait to see whether they are linked to the emergent substantive theory concerning the issue in focus (p. 34).

The logico-deductive theorist, proceeding under the license and mandate of an-

alytic abstraction, engages in premature parsimony when arriving at his theory (p. 35).

A category stands by itself as a conceptual element of the theory. A property, in turn, is a conceptual aspect or element of a category (p. 36).

Working with borrowed categories is more difficult since they are harder to find, fewer in number, and not as rich; since in the long run they may not be relevant, and are not exactly designed for the purpose, they must be respecified. In short, our focus on the emergence of categories solves the problems of fit, relevance, forcing, and richness (p. 37).

As one thinks about the broad spectrum of social life, one realizes that sociologists (with the focused aid of foundations) have really worked in only a small corner of it when posing the larger questions of deviance, social problems, formal organizations, education, mental health, community government, underdeveloped countries, and so forth (p. 38).

The type of concept that should be generated has two, joint, essential features. First, the concepts should be *analytic* — sufficiently generalized to designate characters of concrete entities, not the entities themselves. They should also be *sensitizing* — yield a “meaningful” picture, abetted by apt illustrations that enable one to grasp the reference in terms of one’s own experiences (p. 38).

In the beginning, one’s hypotheses may seem unrelated, but as categories and properties emerge, develop in abstraction, and become related, their accumulating interrelations form an integrated central theoretical framework — *the core of the emerging theory*. The core becomes a theoretical guide to the further collection and analysis of data (p. 40).

Joint collection, coding, and analysis of data is the underlying operation. The generation of theory, coupled with the notion of theory as process, requires that all three operations be done together as much as possible. They should blur and intertwine continually, from the beginning of an investigation to its end (p. 43).

4.3 Chapter 3: Theoretical Sampling

Theoretical sampling is the process of data collection for generating theory whereby the analyst jointly collects, codes, and analyzes his data and decides what data to collect next and where to find them, in order to develop his theory as it emerges (p. 45).

The basic question in theoretical sampling (in either substantive or formal theory) is: *what* groups or subgroups does one turn to *next* in data collection? And for *what* theoretical purpose (p. 47)?

Our logic of *ongoing inclusion* of groups must be differentiated from the logic used in comparative analyses that are focused mainly on accurate evidence for description and verification. That logic, one of preplanned inclusion and exclusion, warns the analyst away from comparing “non-comparable” groups (p. 50).

This effort of purification is made for a result impossible to achieve, since one never really knows what has and has not been held constant (p. 50).

The sociologist developing substantive or formal theory can also usefully *create* groups, provided he keeps in mind that they are an artifact of his research design, and so does not start assuming in his analysis that they have properties possessed by a natural group (p. 52).

However, only a handful of survey researchers have used their skill to create multiple comparison subgroups for discovering theory. This would be a very worthwhile endeavor (p. 53).

Thus, anyone who wishes to discover formal theory should be aware of the usefulness of comparisons made on high level conceptual categories among the seemingly non-comparable; he should actively seek this kind of comparison; do it with flexibility; and be able to interchange the apparently non-comparable comparison with the apparently comparable ones (p. 54).

This control over similarities and differences is vital for discovering categories, and for developing and relating their theoretical properties, all necessary for the further development of an emergent theory. By maximizing or minimizing differences among comparative groups, the sociologist can control the theoretical relevance of his data collection (p. 55).

When maximizing differences among comparative groups (thereby maximizing differences in data) he possesses a more powerful means for stimulating the generation of theoretical properties once his basic framework has emerged (p. 57).

Saturation means that no additional data are being found whereby the sociologist can develop properties of the category (p. 61).

When saturation occurs, the analyst will usually find that some gap in his theory, especially in his major categories, is almost, if not completely filled (p. 61).

Saturation can never be attained by studying one incident in one group. What is gained by studying one group is at most the discovery of some basic categories and a few of their properties. From the study of similar groups (or subgroups within the first group), a few more categories and their properties are yielded. But this is only the beginning of a theory. Then the sociologist should try to saturate his categories by maximizing differences among groups. In the process, he generates his theory (p. 62).

In theoretical sampling, no one kind of data on a category nor technique for data collection is necessarily appropriate (p. 65).

But when different slices of data are submitted to comparative analysis, the result is *not* unbounding relativism. Instead, it is a proportioned view of the evidence, since, during comparison, biases of particular people and methods tend to reconcile themselves as the analyst discovers the underlying causes of variation (p. 68).

Core theoretical categories, those with the most explanatory power, should be saturated as completely as possible. Efforts to saturate less relevant categories should not be made at the cost of resources necessary for saturating the core categories (p.70).

To pace the alternating tempo of these three operations, the sociologist soon learns that the analysis can be usefully accomplished at various times: immediately after leaving the field; during the evening between successive days of data collection; and during two- or three-day, or weekly, respites from data collection (p. 73).

At the beginning of the research, interviews usually consist of open-ended conversations during which respondents are allowed to talk with no imposed limitations of time (p. 75).

Later, when interviews and observations are directed by the emerging theory, he can ask direct questions bearing on his categories. These can be answered sufficiently and fairly quickly (p. 76).

4.4 Chapter 4: From Substance to Formal Theory

There are at least two “rewriting” techniques for advancing a substantive to a formal theory that is grounded in only one substantive area. The sociologist can simply omit substantive words, phrases or adjectives: instead of saying “temporal aspects of *dying* as a nonscheduled status passage” he would say “temporal aspects of nonscheduled status passage.” He can also rewrite a substantive theory up a notch: instead of writing about how doctors and nurses give medical attention to dying patient’s social value, he can talk of how professional services are distributed according to the social value of clients (p. 80).

While the process of comparative analysis is the same for generating either substantive or formal theory, it becomes harder to generate the latter because of its more abstract level and the wider range of research required (p. 82).

The above examples are taken from our research; however, as we noted earlier, anyone can begin generating formal theory directly from published theory (p. 88).

This kind of scrutiny and illustrative extension of Goffman’s theory suggests that an important strategy in generating formal theory through theoretical sampling is to begin with someone else’s formal theory. That theory may be developed less abstractly than Goffman’s and may be tied much more closely to firsthand research. The strategy consists of asking, first of all, what comparisons the author has forgotten or “thrown away” because of his initial focus; second, what comparisons he has suggested in passing but has not followed up; third, what comparisons are suggested directly by his analysis; and fourth, what comparisons are suggested by one’s own reflections on the theory (p. 90).

The more prestigious style of logico-deductive, systematic “grand theorizing” is, in the hands of its most brilliant practitioners, more than merely esthetically satisfying: it also gives impetus to considerable useful, precise verification of hypotheses. But it provides no directive — any more than it did a century ago when Comte and Spencer were its spokesmen — to closing that embarrassingly noticeable gap between highly abstract theory and the multitude of minuscule substantive studies so characteristic of current sociology (p. 97).

Grounded formal theory is thus also highly useful in predictions and explanations when we are consulted about substantive areas where we have no theory, and no time or inclination to develop one. Explanations and prediction from logico-deductive formal theory are used mainly where they will do no harm; that is, in the classroom, as “tacked-on” explanations of accomplished research (as mentioned in Chapter 1), and as hypotheses (prediction) in the service of the perennial testing of parts of a formal theory with the eternal hope that it can be modified to fit reality (p. 98).

4.5 Chapter 5: The Constant comparative Method of Qualitative Analysis

Rather, the constant comparative method is designed to aid the analyst who possesses these abilities in generating a theory that is integrated, consistent, plausible, close to the data — and at the same time is in a form clear enough to be readily, if only partially, operationalized for testing in quantitative research (p. 103)

We shall describe in four stages the constant comparative method: (1) comparing incidents applicable to each category, (2) integrating categories and their properties, (3) delimiting the theory, and (4) writing the theory (p. 105).

1. *Comparing incidents applicable to each category.* The analyst starts by coding each incident in his data into as many categories of analysis as possible, as categories emerge or as data emerge that fit an existing category (p. 105).

To this procedure we add the basic, defining rule for the constant comparative method: *while coding an incident for a category, compare it with the previous incidents in the same and different groups coded in the same category* (p. 106).

As categories and their properties emerge, the analyst will discover two kinds: those that he has constructed himself (such as “social loss” or “calculation” of social loss); and those that have been abstracted from the language of the research situation. (For example, “composure” was derived from nurses’ statements like “I was afraid of losing my composure when the family started crying over their child.” (p. 107)

At this point, the second rule of the constant comparative method is: *stop coding and record a memo on your ideas.* This rule is designed to tap the initial freshness of the analyst’s theoretical notions and to relieve the conflict in his thoughts (p. 107).

From the point of view of generating theory it is often useful to write memos on, as well as code, the copy of one’s field notes (p. 108).

2. *Integrating categories and their properties.* This process starts out in a small way; memos and possible conferences are short. But as the coding continues, the constant comparative units change from comparison of incident with incident to comparison of incident with properties of the category that resulted from initial comparisons of incidents (p. 108).

3. *Delimiting the theory.* As the theory develops, various delimiting features of the constant comparative method begin to curb what could otherwise become an overwhelming task. Delimiting occurs at two levels: the theory and the cate-

gories (p. 110).

By reduction we mean that the analyst may discover underlying uniformities in the original set of categories or their properties, and can then formulate the theory with a smaller set of higher level concepts (p. 110).

Thus, with reduction of terminology and consequent generalizing, forced by constant comparisons (some comparisons can at this point be based on the literature of other professional area), the analyst starts to achieve two major requirement of theory: (1) *parsimony* of variables and formulation, and (2) *scope* in the applicability of the theory to a wide range of situations, while keeping a close correspondence of theory and data (p. 110).

4. *Writing theory.* At this stage in the process of qualitative analysis, the analyst possesses coded data, a series of memos, and a theory. The discussions in his memos provide the content behind the categories, which become the major themes of the theory later presented in papers or books (p. 113).

When the research is convinced that his analytic framework forms a systematic substantive theory, that it is a reasonable accurate statement of the matters studies, and that it is couched in a form that others going into the same field could use — then he can publish his results with confidence (p. 113).

By *diversity* we mean that each incident is compared with other incidents, or with properties of a category, in terms of as many similarities and differences as possible. This mode of comparing is in contrast to coding for crude proofs; such coding only establishes whether an incident indicates the few properties of the category that are being counted (p. 114).

To make theoretical sense of so much diversity in his data, the analyst is forced to develop ideas on a level of generality higher in conceptual abstraction than the qualitative material be analyzed (p. 114).

4.6 Chapter 6: Classifying and Assessing Comparative Studies

Some comparative analyses are made in the service of theories that are accepted as so correct and so useful that researchers wish merely to contribute to them in minor ways (p. 125).

The great complexity of comparative analysis turns out to be “manufactured” complexity of theoretical organization, rather than a genuinely “understood” complexity of the world of events (p. 130).

The very proliferation of footnoted sources and commentaries, plus the variety of time and place drawn upon for illustration, can be translated into an implicit language of verification (p. 137).

Circumstantial sampling leads to much less satisfactory integration than would theoretical sampling (p. 138).

Of course, Shibutani and Kwan also are interested in differential patterns that stem from differential conditions — and discover many — but a focus on similarity and resemblance, to the exclusion of an explicit focus on difference, eliminates on potentially fruitful aspect of an otherwise admirably conducted inquiry (p. 141).

Doubtless his reactions to alternate theories of magic and witchcraft affected some of his field operations; but the very numbers of original categories, their properties, and the relationships — and the degree of integration achieved by cumulative analyses — evinces how grounded in data his theory is. It is grounded — and extensive in scope — precisely because he used comparison carefully and skillfully (p. 150).

Another tradition exists, especially in field work: namely, to initiate the research using only a very general framework with no intention of using a given theory. The assumption is that one’s data will be sufficiently rich to stimulate the generation of good theory. If this new theory can be joined with received theory, well and good; if not, the it can stand itself (p. 152)

4.7 Chapter 7: New Sources for Qualitative Data

The extremely limited range of qualitative materials used by sociologists is largely due to the focus on verification. For many, if not most, researchers, qualitative data is virtually synonymous with field work and interviews, combined with whatever “background” documents may be necessary for putting the research in context (p. 162).

When someone stands in the library stacks, he is, metaphorically, surrounded by voices begging to be heard. Every book, every magazine article, represents at least one person who is equivalent to the anthropologist’s informant or the sociologist’s interviewee. In those publications, people converse, announce positions, argue with a range of eloquence, and describe events or scenes in ways entirely comparable to what is seen and heard during field work. The researcher needs only to discover the voices in the library to release them for his analytic use (p. 163).

Various procedures, or tactics, available to the field worker for gathering data have the analogues in library research (p. 164)

Most caches that would be useful for sociologists take other forms: collections of letters (published and unpublished), a collection of speeches or sermons, a set of proceedings, a symposium, or collection of articles on a single topic by one or several authors (p. 167).

Since generation is most effective when it rests upon the search for comparative materials, caches can hardly be the chief source of data — any more than a bundle or two of interviews (no matter how extensive or on how numerous a population) can suffice for the field theorist (p. 168)

Perhaps we should warn that the discovery of a cache can actually restrict the development of a researcher’s theorizing. Some caches are so esthetically lovely in themselves, so interesting, that the researcher hates to leave the material (p. 168).

How should he proceed in the library? The answer is that he should use *any* materials bearing on his area that he can discover (p. 169).

But comparative method should be brought to bear from the outset. Thus, one should think about regional novelists, about novelists of different ethnic groups, about novelists who wrote for different generations of Americans, about novelists who emigrated from America, and who emigrated here from different parts of the world. One should think of novelists who portrayed rural life and those who pictured city life, those who focused on men and those who were most interested in women (p. 169).

Of course, novels are not the only source of categories; any materials that force a range of comparisons will be useful: letters, diaries, newspaper accounts, or other miscellaneous nonfiction (p. 170).

So the researcher needs to cultivate functional synonyms for his topic in order to explore relevant categories fully (p. 171).

In short, a calculated strategy of search and scrutiny for data on off-beat groups is a necessity and will be exceptionally rewarding (p. 173).

“Pinpointing,” a procedure that tends to be used relatively late in one’s inquiry, pertains mainly to integrating theory through the checking of detailed points suggested by specific hypotheses. It is an equally valuable tactic when used with library data (p. 173).

In closing this section on procedures, we cannot refrain from reminding sociologists that the writings of sociologists, of any era, as well as the writings of other social scientists, are fair game for comparative researchers (p. 173).

From our own experience, library research is faster than either interviewing or field research, when these enterprises are personally conducted (p. 179).

Whether he is interested in substantive or formal theory, the rule is: maximize those comparison groups! That rule may lead to the library (p. 179).

The *first* stricture that must be made against library materials is that some groups or institutions evolve and disappear without leaving much, if any, documentary trace (p. 180).

A *second* possible disadvantage of library materials, for some theorizing, is that information yielded by the writer (whether about himself or events described) can be purposely misleading (p. 181).

A *third* potential disadvantage is that library sources may be deficient if events reported by observers are simply inaccurate renditions of those events. By contrast, the field worker has been trained to make careful observations, to note precisely which of his observations can be given more credence than others — and why, and to report his observations accurately in his field notes (p. 181).

A *fourth* potential disadvantage of library materials is that by comparison with careful field notes, they may not always afford a continuity of unfolding events in the kind of detail that the theorist requires (p. 182).

Library research has a *fifth* disadvantage when compared with the field, or even

interview, research. Sometimes field researches are precipitated when the researcher realizes that he is already a participant in, or a privileged observer to, some interesting group's activity. He would be denying the richness of his own experience with the group if he chose not to study it in preference to doing library research (p. 183).

4.8 Chapter 8: Theoretical Elaboration of Quantitative Data

However, some of our best monographs based on quantitative data indicate that they can be a very rich medium for discovering theory. In these monographs, discovery cannot be stopped, but breaks through both verifications and preconceived conceptual schemes to provide us with very interesting and important theory (p. 185).

When the sociologist consciously starts out to suggest a theory plausibly, rather than test it provisionally, then he can relax many rules for obtaining evidence and verifications that would otherwise limit, stultify or squelch the generation of theory (p. 186).

Secondary analysis, then, is uniquely well suited for the generation of theory but is often severely limited for description and verification — for which it is still mostly used, with a typical preface about “limitations” (p. 189).

But when theory is the purpose (as stated in Chapter II), there are two reasons why the representativeness of the sample is not an issue. First, the direction of a relationship used to suggest a hypothesis is assumed to exist until disproved, in both biased and unbiased populations; and, second, theoretical (not statistical) sampling guides the choosing and handling of the data (p. 189).

Further, crude indices need only be dichotomized to obtain comparative groups, not cut into several groups (p. 191).

If the index “works” — that is, if it is consistently related to a whole series of variables that, when put together, yield an integrated theory — this is validation enough of a core index. Integration of the theory is, in fact, a more trustworthy validation of an index than the standard method of merely showing that an obvious relationship exists between the index and another questionnaire item, and that therefore the index must measure what it is supposed to measure (p. 192).

The theoretical relevance of the concept is soon demonstrated by whether or not its index actually works in a multitude of cross-tabulations (p. 193).

Indeed, the rule for generation of theory is *not* to have any pre-set or valued hypotheses, but to maintain a sensitivity to all possible theoretical relevances among the hundreds of possible runs afforded by large surveys (p. 194).

In order to saturate all possible findings for suggesting hypotheses, the analyst may take his core concepts and run them with literally *every* other questionnaire item in the survey that seems remotely relevant to his area of interest (p. 194).

A consistency index is a list of single questionnaire items which all indicate the

same category, such as cosmopolitan, and all relate separately to the core index in the same consistent direction (p. 197).

“Canceling out” means that the relationship may be positive under one condition and negative under another; so that when combined the partial relationships cancel themselves out to result in a weak general association. However, it is theoretically very relevant and interesting to be able to say how conditions minimize, maximize, or cancel out a relationship. Also, even if partials are weak, the theoretical relevance of a weak relationship between two indices may be the *weakness* itself (p. 201).

The absence of a relationship becomes just as important as an increase above the consistent percentage level, for any degree of association (or lack of it) may be part of the theory (p. 202).

The previous section presented the first step in our style of theoretical analysis of quantitative data: saturating core indices with all possible two-variable runs; discovering relationship among the runs with theoretically relevant consistency indices, summation indices and single questionnaire items; then analyzing the findings with theoretical inferences. The next step, which cannot be neglected, is *elaboration analysis* — to make three or more variable analyses in order to saturate categories further by developing their properties and thereby achieving a denser theory. Thus, the discovery of relationships among indices provides the analyst with beginning suggestions for a theory, plus a theoretical direction and focus for its elaboration (p. 205).

By “elaboration” we mean that the two-variable associations, which are the basis of theoretical hypotheses, must have their structural conditions specified; their causes and consequences sought, with possible spurious factors checked for; and their intervening variables (delineating processes between the variables) discovered (p. 205).

Theoretical ordering of variables occurs by two strategies: (1) running all possible three-variable associations with each theoretically relevant two-variable association; and (2) running particular tables to fill in gaps or to answer questions, which emerge as the theory develops, by arranging elaboration tables according to the dictates of the theory (p. 207).

Theoretical ordering of variables by all possible three-variable associations on core two-variable relationship is done by comparing the partial association percentage differences to the percentage difference of the original relationship. When the partials vary above and below the original relationship, then the analyst discovers conditions that minimize and maximize his core relationship (p. 208).

When both partials are less than the original relationship (they never completely disappear), then the analyst must theoretically suggest whether the third variable is (1) an intervening variable, thus suggesting a theoretical process between two core variables, or (2) an antecedent variable (p. 208).

With imagination and ingenuity he can theoretically order his variables by time, structural complexity, conceptual generality, or in any other theoretical manner. His job is to suggest a theory based on both the *theoretically relevant order* of elaborated relationships and on the *content* of the variables he employs (p. 209).

4.9 Chapter 9: The Credibility of Grounded Theory

The theory that emerges from the researcher's collection and analysis of qualitative data is in one sense equivalent to what he *knows systematically* about his own data (p. 223).

The evolving systematic analysis permits a field worker quite literally to write prescriptions so that other outsiders could get along in the observed sphere of life and action (p. 226).

Finally, it is worth special mention that those field workers who do not really believe in their own hard-won substantive theory are tempted toward a compulsive scientism. Because they do not trust themselves — their own ability to know or reason — they rely in addition upon questionnaires or other “objective” methods of collecting and analyzing quantified data. When used for this purpose, those methods do not necessarily lead to greater credibility, but they do permit the insecure researcher to feel greater security in his “results” without really considering what specific queries do or do not need this additional “hard” data (p. 227).

In addition, the constant comparative method's requirement of keeping track of one's ideas increases the probability that the theory will be well integrated and clear, since the analyst is forced to make theoretical sense of each comparison. Making sure the categories of the theory and their properties are meaningfully interrelated is difficult enough; keeping all the interrelations clearly delineated is an added difficulty. The integration and clarity of the theory will, however, increase the probability that colleagues will accept its credibility (p. 230).

Such reader qualification of the theory we may term “the discounting process.” Readers surely discount aspects of many, if not most, published analyses (whether they rest upon qualitative or quantitative data). This discounting takes several forms: the theory is *corrected* because of one-sided research designs, *adjusted* to fit the diverse conditions of different social structures, *invalidated* for other structures through the reader's experience or knowledge, and deemed *inapplicable* to yet other kinds of structures (p. 231).

The researcher and his readers thus share a *joint responsibility*. The researcher ought to provide sufficiently clear statements of theory and description so that readers can carefully assess the credibility of the theoretical framework he offers (p. 232).

4.10 Chapter 10: Applying Grounded Theory

The first requisite property is that the theory must closely *fit* the substantive area in which it will be used. Second, it must be readily *understandable* by laymen concerned with this area. Third, it must be sufficiently *general* to be applicable to a multitude of diverse daily situations within the substantive area, not to just a specific type of situation. Fourth, it must allow the user partial *control* over the structure and process of daily situations as they change through time (p. 237).

Clearly, a grounded theory that is faithful to the everyday realities of a substantive area is one that has been carefully *induced* from diverse data, as we have described the process. Only in this way will the theory be closely related to the daily realities (what is actually going on) of substantive areas, and so be highly applicable to dealing with them (p. 239).

A grounded substantive theory that corresponds closely to the realities of an area will make sense and be understandable to the people working in the substantive area (p. 239).

Their understanding the theory tends to engender a readiness to use it, for it sharpens their sensitivity to the problems that they face and gives them an image of how they can potentially make matters better, through either their own efforts or those of a sociologist (p. 240).

In deciding upon the conceptual level of categories, the sociologist generating theory should be guided by the criteria that the categories should not be so abstract as to lose their sensitizing aspect, but yet must be abstract enough to make his theory a general guide to multi-conditional, ever-changing daily situations (p. 242).

The person who applies theory becomes, in effect, a generator of theory, and in this instance the theory is clearly seen as *process*: an ever-developing entity (p. 242).

Because he is severely limited in meeting the varied conditions and situations typical of the total picture, the person who applies a quantitatively derived theory frequently finds himself either guideless or trying to apply the inapplicable — with potentially unfortunate human and organizational consequences. This kind of theory typically does not account for enough variation in situations to allow appreciable institution and control of change in them. Also, such theory usually does not offer sufficient means for predicting the diverse consequences of any purposeful action on other aspects of the substantive area, which one does not wish to change but which will surely be affected by the action (p. 243).

The substantive theory must enable the person who uses it to have enough control in everyday situations to make its application worth trying. The control we have in mind has various aspects. The person who applies the theory must be enabled to understand and analyze ongoing situational realities, to produce and predict change in them, and to predict and control consequences both for the object of change and for other parts of the total situation that will be affected (p. 245).

First, the theory must provide controllable variables with *much explanatory power*: they must “make a big difference” in what is going on in the situation that is to be changed (p. 247).

Access variables. A grounded theory to be used in practice must also include access variables. These are social structural variables that allow, guide, and give persons access either to the controllable variables or to the people who control them (p. 248).

4.11 Chapter 11: Insight and Theory Development

The root sources of all significant theorizing is the sensitive insights of the observer himself (p. 251).

The first corollary is that the researcher can get — and cultivate — crucial insights not only during research (and from his research) but from his own personal experiences prior to or outside it (p. 252).

A related corollary is that such insights need not come from one's own experience but can be taken from others. In this case the burden is on the sociologist to convert these borrowed experiences into his own insights (p. 252).

If we can do this [gain insight from their experience] with an interviewee or an informant, why not with the author of an autobiography or a novel (p. 253)?

A third corollary pertains to how fruitful insights can be gotten from existing theory (p. 253).

Some men seem to handle the precarious balance between the two sources by avoiding the reading of much that relates to the relevant area until after they return from the field; they do this so as not to interfere with personal insights. On the other hand, some read extensively beforehand. Others periodically return to one or the other source for stimulation. There is no ready formula, of course: one can only experiment to find which style of work gives the best results. Not to experiment toward this end, but carefully to cover "all" the literature before commencing research, increases the probability of brutally destroying one's potentialities as a theorist (p. 253).

A more systematic method (one to be recommended heartily) is that the researcher regard all statements about events pertaining to the area under study as being data. This means that the statements and writings of colleagues are data as much as those of laymen. Sociologists also must be considered as part of the social structure; and a developing theory must therefore take them and their statements into account as a slice of data (p. 254).

Any contest between insights and existing theory becomes a comparative analysis that delimits the boundaries of the existing theory while generating a more general one (p. 255).

5 Transcript of Interview: July 25, 2008

Andrew

Alright...um, so this is what I need, I've been thinking about doing. Um...I'm thinking about, well, for my project, ah, asking people to talk about the, ah, what experiences that they remember from high school, but um, specifically things they learned in high school then what that was like, what the learning experience was like. So, um...maybe generally, what were...

Grandpa

Oh, well, you're going back a long way, oh Jesus...

Andrew

Yeah, I know. But do you, what do you remember about high school?

Grandpa

Not much...

Andrew

Not much,

Grandpa

I remember going across the street, where the guy had hamburgers for a nickel, and you could get a double for a dime, on a hard role...

Andrew

Well, so well what kind of classes did you take in high school?

Grandpa

Well, I, I took ah, ah I took math, and english, and ahhhh, all kind of things. I don't...you know, I'm talking, you talking about 1942, 1941, 1940 I think I started high school. I, 40, it was 43 when I graduated. And, and I graduated in, in a February because ah, they had early graduation if you went into the service, and you didn't have to wait until June to get your diploma.

Andrew

So what did they do with the last couple months of school you had?

Grandpa

I don't know.

Andrew

You just didn't have to be there?

Grandpa

I guess if you had the, I you had a clean record, you could do it, you know?

Andrew

Really?

Grandpa

So, I got my diploma in the mail. Ah, if I would've waited until eighteen...I was eighteen ah, I would've had to register for the draft, and I was, God, I didn't want to go into the army. [Laughs]. I wanted to go into the Navy.

Andrew

Yeah, so...that was, I didn't...OK, so you didn't want to, ah, I didn't know that, that's why you did that.

Grandpa

Um, yeah, but they had some sort of stipulation. I don't know whether it was just in the New York school system or all over the country. But if you, if you left within three months of your graduation, ah, you, you would be considered, um, graduated, you got a diploma. Which I did, I got a diploma. And, what, what do you do the last few months before the...

Andrew

Right...

Grandpa

Very little, right?

Andrew

Well, I know, not too much.

Grandpa

Yeah

Andrew

Well, especially the last couple of weeks, but, so, um... so when did you, when did you decide to go into the Navy then?

Grandpa

Oh, ah, hey, I was ah, when, when the war started I was, what, I was fifteen, sixteen. I had to wait 'till I was over seventeen for the se..the Navy and the Marines signed people up with their parents consent.

Andrew

Yeah

Grandpa

If their seventeen, where as the Army, you couldn't even joint the Army until you were eighteen so...but, um, my father always said, my father was in the Navy in World War I, and you know, he said...I'm talkin' about over a year, it was over a year after the war start, about fifteen months into the war, because the war started in December of 41, December 7th, so it was three weeks left in 41, and then it was 42, so that was twelve months, and then it went into February, that made fourteen plus you add on, ah, fourteen, fifteen months, whatever it was. So, my father always said, "If you go into the Navy, wherever you go, you're going to get a, normally a clean place to sleep..."

Andrew

Right

Grandpa

And a...and a hot meal [laughs]

Andrew

Yeah

Grandpa

Ah, [inaudible] I did enough camping out as a kid, that I knew what the hell camping out was.

Andrew

Right

Grandpa

'Cause I used to go to camp in the summer time. Then we were going on overnight hikes and shit like that, you know, when you had to build a campfire and, and if you were in the Army, you were in some battle zone, you couldn't even build a campfire.

Andrew

Right, right

Grandpa

You know? Ah, shit on that [laughs]

Andrew

So what, so, so um...so that was the combination, I was going to ask you whether or not it was something, if it was your...the fact that your dad was in the Navy or if it was the fact that you didn't want to be in the Army that...

Grandpa

Oh...a combination...

Andrew

Yeah, yeah. So, but do you remember, do you remember any of your teachers?

Grandpa

My teachers? I'm trying to ah, oh, I had a teacher for french that I, I once had french, she was impossible. She was a french women.

Andrew

Uh huh...

Grandpa

[Laughs] An immigrant I think, you know. Oh God, she was impossible, crazy. She was a little bit [laughs, signals crazy] like that...

Andrew

Was it just her manner, the way she was in class? Or...

Grandpa

Yeah, oh yeah, very high strung, you know? And, oh, she, she didn't have, ah..., no pity for anybody. Oh this women...and if you were a little slow with some of that stuff...oh she...she went into you, you know, and then, forget it, you were lost.

Andrew

Yeah

Grandpa

Yeah, so, but ah, so no, and then I took spanish which I had a good teacher, and I passed some spanish [laughs].

Andrew

Why, wha, wha, why was that a good teacher?

Grandpa

Because, eh, she was calm, and she, she ah, she made sure people understood what was going on. You know, I always said, a good teacher gets it across, no matter how dumb you are. I know, I had a guy, ah, when I was, when I was up in NYU, was teaching electronics, he was a professor. He was a smart egg. He went during the war he was a eh, a big, a troubleshooter for the Marines in electronics, all throughout the Pacific. So he knew what he was talking about. But he brought every subject up so it was so clear and, and you could grasp it. You know what I mean? Whatever it was. And eh, because you know how to put it across. And you know the trouble with that guy? He was, he had...he left NYU, you know why?

Andrew

Why?

Grandpa

'Cause the next time I seen him, he was on television, talkin' about somethin' for General Electric. [laughs]

Andrew

But what did, well what did, ah...what did he do? Did he, was it just the way he talked about things or was it...

Grandpa

Well, he explained it, you know? And he, he didn't rush through it, but he had a time schedule he had to work on. But, everybody seemed to get it. And, I always took notes, and to me, that was the best way of...of retaining the, was you take notes on it. Even if you never look at the notes, just to...

Andrew

The act...

Grandpa

Just the act of taking the notes you have to concentrate, you, your mind can't wander, while he's talking to you.

Andrew

Right

Grandpa

'Cause you've got to concentrate. To, to take the notes.

Andrew

Did you take notes in french?

Grandpa

Oh, God no. That was impossible.

Andrew

[Laughs]

Grandpa

I'll tell you one thing. I took, um...The ma...when I was going to high school, my hand writing was oh...miserable. And, ah, they had a penmanship class, I had to take six months of penmanship.

Andrew

Really?

Grandpa

It's an amazing thing. You know?

Andrew

Did it help?

Grandpa

Oh, it helped...[laughs] measurably.

Andrew

Wha, wha, what was that?

Grandpa

Oh, well they would start, they would give all sorts of exercises, like doin' slants. Slants, and then you do, you know like on a legal pad, or something. And, you go up and down, up and down. Then you make o's and o's and o's. And these are exercises to get you, get you workin'. And, then you would work on, on different words...but, but by the time I finished, my handwriting improved about a thousand percent.

Andrew

It was only six...it was only one time for six months you said, or six weeks?

Grandpa

Yeah, that's right. It was...

Andrew

Six weeks or six months?

Grandpa

They must of known what they were doin'.

Andrew

Right

Grandpa

You know? Because they had a whole class of people. I guess the picked out the worst [laughs]

Andrew

I probably would have been there too.

Grandpa

Yeah, but they...you know that David that used to work at, over at the inn?

Andrew

Yeah...

Grandpa

Oh, he had miserable handwriting, he couldn't read what he wrote. One time, I said David, you know...I said if you try, you can really improve your handwriting. "Ah, no, I can't I can't...". I tell you, he's a...amish, his family was amish, you know? Arrogant. "No, I can't". Impossible. If that you're attitude...[laughs] But, if you make an effort, you can improve your penmanship. It takes a little work on it, you know?

Andrew

Yeah...

Grandpa

I mean we used to make those o's and o's, and then you would make slants, slants, and then you would go alphabet. I think we did the alphabet so many times too. She always had some sort of a different exercise. And, the whole trick was to make you, your handwriting legible. You know?

Andrew

Yeah...

Grandpa

And it worked.

Andrew

How many...well, how many kids were in there?

Grandpa

Oh, God, I don't know. The avera...the average class was around twenty...twenty five to thirty or something like that.

Andrew

Um...But you don't remember math in high school?

Grandpa

Oh, yeah...

Andrew

What'd you do in there?

Grandpa

Oh, we did the geometry, we did ah...ah...I don't know if I did trigonometry in high school...I'm trying to remember. I know, I know I did some geometry.

Andrew

Do you remember any of those classes or any of those...

Grandpa

Oh, that's so long ago, Andrew, you know?

Andrew

Yeah...

Grandpa

I learned a little aerodynamics because, they had what they called war courses.

Andrew

What was that word, aerodynamics?

Grandpa

Aerodynamics

Andrew

Oh, yeah, OK.

Grandpa

I took, I took ah...a course in aerodynamics, they wanted to prepare [laughs] for the service, see? It was a good education...you learned a lot of things, even though you don't apply them, you, you're still learning something, you know what I mean?

Andrew

Yeah.

Grandpa

In fact, ah...Bernoulli's Principle. Who knew about, who knew about Bernoulli's Principle before that? [laughs] You know?

Andrew

That was they ah...

Grandpa

That was the...

Andrew

...the pressure

Grandpa

Yeah, well...the, the pressure from, because that why the wings got the curvature, because ah...that gives it the lift.

Andrew

Right, because the air has to go...

Grandpa

The lift depends on the pressure on top and on bottom.

Andrew

Yeah...but you learned that in high school?

Grandpa

Yeah, so I had a course in aerodynamics.

Andrew

Yeah...

Grandpa

Six months I think I took that, so...

Andrew

Well, that, so then how were classes scheduled? Six months at a time instead of...

Grandpa

Oh, yeah, yeah. Yeah, you had a, you didn't have a whole year. You had, ah...six months time, because you had graduation, you used to have graduation in ah, ah...I think from [inaudible] No, there was a different change in classes after...you know they had a first half, where they...and then you had two semesters.

Andrew

Right, right.

Grandpa

But, ah, I think it started, in the, in the...in you know, September. That was when you first started, when you went to high school, you started in September. That, that was, your first year was 'till the next September then was when the second year started.

Andrew

Oh...

Grandpa

But you had two, you don't have the same schedule...

Andrew

Yeah

Grandpa

For the, the second semester than you had in the first. They could, it depended on, on what you were supposed to be learning, you know what I mean?

Andrew

So did they, well oh...so did they, did you have a track or a path that you were following depending on...

Grandpa

I don't know. They had, yes, what they had, um...ah...[inaudible]. Like if you were planning on going to college, you, you wanted to...what the hell, you know my brain isn't workin' as sharp as it used to...

Andrew

Well, it's a long time ago, obviously...

Grandpa

Ah...what the hell did they call that? You know they, you were going for ah..

Andrew

Like a trade?

Grandpa

No, no, you weren't going for a trade. They had, they had two, two different categories really. If you were goin', if you were goin' for um...like you were going to go to college, you would, or you, you went for ah...for more ah...oh what would I say...academic things, you were on one side, and if you were going to go for a job when you get out of high school, you go for another place. 'Cause in order to get into college you had to have all certain courses re...you know, required in high school.

Andrew

Right.

Grandpa

So, that's what they call academic, I think, maybe it was an academic thing. I forget what they called it, it might have been academic.

Andrew

It could have been.

Grandpa

I don't remember...so long ago.

Andrew

What about, what about NYU? Other than the electronics, how many classes did you take there?

Grandpa

Oh, well, we had see, what they call a quadrangle. It was up on Washington Heights. It was beautiful up there. Not like down, downtown where Ellen went.

Andrew

Yeah...

Grandpa

Yeah, that was...so, it made a world of difference. 'Cause up there on Washington Heights, it was a beautiful campus, really. With ah, ah...they called it the quadral...ah...quadrangle, because they had four, you had four different educational, ah...engineering things. You had, ah...electrical engineering, which had ah...two different components. You had ah...you had ah...electronic or power. And then you had thermodynamics. Ah...I don't know what the hell category that came under. You had mechanical engineering, architectural engineering, and ah...

Andrew

Well that's three...right, that's four...

Grandpa

I don't know...there was another one

Andrew

Electrical, mechanical...

Grandpa

Yeah...

Andrew

Right...

Grandpa

Yeah...

Andrew

And the one with thermodynamics...

Grandpa

Yeah, yeah, well that could be, that could be four, because...But you took, see, when you went, when you went and you went to these other engineering things, they had, the course was, that you took there, you were, it wasn't your major. It was a little more modified, a little easier, then what...So, in other words, you went to mechanical engineering, ah thing, but you were majoring in electrical, electronics or something like that, the course is easier than if you were going to ah...if you were going to be um..a mechanical engineer..

Andrew

So you had to ah...you...if you were in that class, there was...probably everybody was not a mechanical engineer.

Grandpa

Yeah, well...it was, I would say it was a little [inaudible], but you learn a lot, you learn all about... 'cause the strength of materials, whatever thought about strength of materials? Very important, right?

Andrew

Right.

Grandpa

You learn about thermodynamics...super, superheated steam. I never heard about superheated steam, before [laughs]

Andrew

What is that, they put it under pressure...?

Grandpa

Under pressure, under pressure.

Andrew

Yeah.

Grandpa

And, that can burn a hole right through you.

Andrew

Really?

Grandpa

Oh yeah, that why it's...ah...some of those ships were so...were so dangerous when the steam lines broke.

Andrew

Yeah.

Grandpa

You know? 'Cause that what...you know, there was, we had, there was books with charts, you know, how much pressure, how much, ah...how many degrees of heat, and everything else. And you could figure out ah...the...what the hell would you figure out...so, they get a figure for something...the power behind it or whatever...you know?

Andrew

And also, what...you probably have to figure out whatever...I mean that would go into designing things that hold that stuff too...right?

Grandpa

Yeah, yeah.

Andrew

So what, so...do you remember more teachers at NYU? Or was it, were there less that you were exposed to?

Grandpa

Oh, NYU...there were...we used to have, um...we used to go to a whole, general, like an assembly almost, for, for ah...english literature [laughs].

Andrew

Uh huh...

Grandpa

And, ah...they have ah...it might have been a hundred fifty guys in there...and ah...they would talk about different things, life for instance, english, for english literature they talk about ah...Chaucer's Canterbury Tales, Beowolf, and things like that. You know? I forget what...Shakespeare and...and you'd have to write, eh...write a watchyoumacallit...you know, a paper on it.

Andrew

Yeah.

Grandpa

It was more of a...we used to call them crap classes, really [laughs].

[Andrew laughs]

Grandpa

'Cause it wasn't technical, you know?

Andrew

Yeah, yeah.

Grandpa

No math attached to it [laughs] no physics attached to it...

Andrew

But um...um...is was, did that in any way, um...I mean, why do you read so much now? I mean, did you always read so much? Or is it something that...

Grandpa

Because I started reading a lot was because I felt gyped. I went to, I went to ah...public school. The kids I used to play with all the time went to parochial school.

Andrew

Yeah...

Grandpa

And, all I knew about history was Pilgrims landed at Plymouth rock. That's when history started. These guys knew the Crusades, the Romans, the Greeks...and I was pissed off...so I just, I used to take books out of the library and read up on these things. You know? But...like all this ancient history [inaudible] and then I'd get interested in...I mean, eh...I very seldom read...I, I read Gone With the Wind, but most the...if I would read something it would be a mystery, and then I would, I would like to read mysteries and stuff like that, or a...adventure stories. And ah...[inaudible] I was a kid I got Tom Sawyer one year for Christmas, you know, and Huckleberry Finn. I read those...and no, but eh...that's all I read. I was there...but then after I get in the Navy eh...I used to, they used to send us boxes of books, paperbacks maybe, but they were all different sizes, they weren't as uniform as you see them today. You had some that were flat and long...If you ever see that movie...ah...um...ah...what the hell is that? The Big Red One. All about the ah...first division in the Army. The movie goes all through North Africa, Sicily, Italy, and into France with these soldiers. With ah...Lee Marvin is in this, see, he plays the Sergeant. But it's very, it's very interesting, you see, you see times with these guys sitting on the road and this guys always got a book out that he got in the mail from the Army someplace, you know. And then too, I they had the, you could take the courses in the, eh...what the hell do they call it? Eh...you know, educational courses.

Andrew

In the Navy...

Grandpa

Yeah. Yeah, you by mail you know?

Andrew

Oh, yeah.

Grandpa

But, I took eh...advanced algebra I think it was... 'cause I wanted to get up on some of those things you know? And they, they would send stuff all the time. You would have to fill out, do the problems and whatnot, and mail it back to them.

Andrew

Really, and how many classes did you do that way?

Grandpa

Ah...I did math, some math. You got the trigonometry with that too. 'Cause I didn't, I don't think I had trigonometry in high school. But eh...yeah, trig is very important.

Andrew

Yeah.

Grandpa

Even in, even if you go into electricity, it's extremely important. You've got all your, eh...oh shit, you know, trigonometric functions, all important, for instance if you, especially if you are doing radio or television stuff, your checkin' on these waves, you know, and whatnot, and signals and...

Andrew

Yeah.

Grandpa

There's all kinds of formulas you have to use, but they all, they all work on ah...through trig, because that's eh...the sine wave, you know the sine wave.

Andrew

Yeah

Grandpa

You know, that's trigonometry.

Andrew

Right.

Grandpa

So that, in fact I got a slide rule, I think I gave it to Charles years ago. Ah, what the hell was it...It, it had a whole, one whole side of the slipstick was all about trigonometric functions. Used to call it sine-sine-deci-trig, or something like that.

Andrew

It slid?

Grandpa

Yeah, 'cause you would...you see, the slide, slide rules were used long before computers came along.

Andrew

Right.

Grandpa

You know? So you, you were allowed to use a slide rule, you used it when you took tests, even. Used it for your homework. [laughs] But you don't, you can't get an exact figure, you have to estimate, and you have to know where to put the decimal point. You know, is was...these kids nowadays, they got the computers, the calculators...even the, in college any engineering students had a slide rule. The cost about twenty bucks in those days, I don't know what the hell they would cost now. But, and the, you would have to make sure you, you got a, an approximate answer, as close as you could, and you had to be very sure you knew where to put the decimal point. And by the, and even if you don't need a slide rule any more, those thing stick with you, you know?

Andrew

Right.

Grandpa

I mean, how many of these kids in high school, you give them a problem, they don't know where the hell to put the decimal point, if the, if the machine don't give it to them?

Andrew

Why do you think they, it stuck with you, because you did them a lot or...?

Grandpa

What? Oh...

Andrew

The, the ah, that stuff, the slide rule, using the slide rules? Just because you did so much of it?

Grandpa

Oh, well, you know, you're doin' it all the time...

Andrew

Yeah.

Grandpa

And I don't, I couldn't do much with a slide rule today, but what I mean is, it makes you aware of things, even if you're doing common math, it makes you aware. You have to be sure you know where you're putting the decimal point. You know? [laughs] Even if it's money, you're doin' something on interest rate. You can really screw it up if you move the decimal point.

Andrew

Right.

Grandpa

Moving it one or the other the wrong way.

Andrew

But your point is, that if you don't, if the machine does everything for you, then you...

Grandpa

Well then you don't know. You can't check on a machine? See, if I was workin' on a machine, I..., the machine come with a decimal point, I would think about it, make sure it's in the right place.

Andrew

Yeah.

Grandpa

'Cause you can still make an honest mistake with a calculator or even on a computer, right?

Andrew

Right, putting it in wrong...

Grandpa

And come with something that's got a misplaced decimal or something. You never know. I mean, I don't know too much about computers.

Andrew

Yeah, no. Well, you right. I mean especially, even if...well ah...sometimes I have a calculator that does like hexadecimal stuff which is base...base eight maybe, instead of base ten.

Grandpa

Oh, the logarithm?

Andrew

Yeah..

Grandpa

Oh, used to have a base ten, and a, and a natural logarithm. It was epsilon. Two point...

Andrew

Seven something...isn't it

Grandpa

Two point one seven or something like that. I forget it. I know, I know, I really don't, I used to know epsilon...it was a big long number.

Andrew

Yeah.

Grandpa

But that's, they call it the natural logarithm because that number, I don't know how, always ah...would come up in natural cau...in natural things. I don't know, you know in astrology, I mean not astrology, astronomy or in some kind of natural thing. And the number used to come up, so the called it [laughs] natural. Natural logarithm.

Andrew

It's "e" right?

Grandpa

Hah?

Andrew

It's little "e"

Grandpa

Epsilon, yeah.

Andrew

I didn't, I never used it that much.

Grandpa

Yeah, yeah, that's why you have two tables. I don't know if I gave those books to Charles or I still got 'em in that bookcase over there in that room there.

Andrew

Oh, yeah...that room.

Grandpa

Because I, you know I painted it, and I started puttin' some stuff in there. I used to go in there because, give me, give your grandmother some space. I used to close the door and the window open and...

Andrew

Yeah.

Grandpa

...smoke a cigar [laughs]

Andrew

I remember. Wasn't that long ago, really.

Grandpa

Yeah, yeah, I know. But eh...things kept commin' and then...did you ever find out if eh, Angie's mother or father were, ah...wanted that sewing machine, it was ah...your grandmother's stepmother.

Andrew

I have it.

Grandpa

No, I never...

Andrew

You have a different sewing machine?

Grandpa

Another one there, it's in a...the one, between you and I, it was the one that Edie was going to, that I fixed up for Edie and then it was, she was gonna' sell it and I got mad and I took it.

Andrew

Oh.

Grandpa

But, this is got a, a dark wood cabinet. It's a real nice furniture cabinet.

Andrew

No. That's the one I have

Grandpa

Well, how did you get that? Recently?

Andrew

Since you moved here, I think.

Grandpa

No, no no...It's still there...isn't it still there?

Andrew

The Singer?

Grandpa

I thought it was still there. I had stuff piled, my videos piled on it...

Andrew

I don't know. I think I have it. But, Angie wants it, were not giving it to them.

Grandpa

Oh, Ok. Fine eh...good. This thing...

Andrew

It's black, right.

Grandpa

No, it's a dark, a dark color like that furniture there...

Andrew

But the machine, isn't the machine black?

Grandpa

Yeah, it's a Singer

Andrew

Yeah, we have it. We have it.

Grandpa

When did you get it? You couldn't have got it recently. You would remember when. I think it's still there Andrew.

Andrew

We'll have to check.

Grandpa

Huh?

Andrew

No, it's been next to my bed for, well, we moved it 'cause we got a big bed, we have it now, but um...maybe a year, could it be a year? I don't know. I could show it to you, I could bring it over.

Andrew

I don't know what, to tell you the truth, but we'll find out. But anyway

Grandpa

Yeah, was the one you were going to give Aunt Edie in wood, or was it...

Grandpa

No, no. This one had a light cabinet with a eh...she bought it and it was no good and I told her that it needed a workin' on, so I worked on it and fixed it up. And ah...it was fine, then she was having a garage sale, you know, always stuff...

Andrew

Yeah.

Grandpa

You didn't have sticky hands, that stuck to her hands, it just slid through all the time

[Andrew laughs]

Grandpa

But she's going to put it out, I said "no", you know, it pissed me off, all the work I did on it for her...

Andrew

Yeah.

Grandpa

She's going to sell it in a garage sale. So that's why I took it, I didn't want, even though, it'd just lay around, I didn't want her...

Andrew

Yeah.

Grandpa

Her to have it. [laughs] 'Cause my history with her goes back a long time.

Andrew

Yeah. Well, um...let me ask you a couple more questions, then we'll see if we can, 'cause I'm trying to finish up...what time is it?

Grandpa

It's three thirty-five.

Andrew

OK. Can you, OK, well who's your favorite teacher? Was it that guy at NYU, or was it someone else?

Grandpa

Oh, yeah. I, ah...that last name was Annah, Professor Annah. He was, he was great.

Andrew

And ah...

Grandpa

And the biggest character, listen to this. I had an exchange professor in, in electric machinery. And ah...his name was eh...Dr. Guiseppi Calibrese. He come from...what the hell was that, jeeze, I'm tring to think of where in Italy. Ah...in northern Italy someplace, some big city in northern Italy. But he was an exchange professor, and was, oh he was a pistol, to try to understand what he was sayin', with that accent, you know?

Andrew

Yeah.

Grandpa

But, but that Gui-sep-pi Cal-i-brese [laughs]

Andrew

So he was just there for a brief period of time...

Grandpa

Yeah, yeah. Yeah, they, the...I don't know if they do that anymore, but in those days, I guess in the forties that had these exchange professors...

Andrew

Huh...

Grandpa

You know, from different countries

Andrew

What about, ah...can you remember any, like...ah...what's your most memorable experience in any school? In either, if you remember any from high school or, most, like do you have any memories from, from, from even elementary that have stuck with you at all?

Grandpa

Oh, Jesus Andrew...I don't know, I don't know, you know, seventeen I went into the Navy, then I went to two more schools [laughs]

Andrew

What's, what other school?

Grandpa

I went to the, the fleet sound school of sonar to study sonar...

Andrew

What was that like?

Grandpa

Well, that was, that was pretty strict. It was a, you worked on, on a sonar, you know to hunt for submarines, and ah, used to have mock ups of things you know, and you'd work on that and then you would go out on a, on a training cruise, with a, on a ship with a, working with a submarine. That was interesting. And you would learn various things too, you know ah...you had to plot, you had to plot the submarines and stuff like that to see how they were goin'. And, you know, there's two ways to plot. Ah...one is um...ah, you move, ah, you get relative, you get, you just get relative because, ah...you both movin'

Andrew

Right.

Grandpa

So there's, if ah...I forget just if [burps] excuse me...but ah...and you would ah...then you would be one...we had to plot what they called a DRT. How do I remember that DRT? It's a dead reckoning ah...ah...ah, tracer. It was, you had to, had a machine with a top, and that was, that was set to your course and speed. So, every bearing and range you got, every fix on anything was a true ah...position. And then, when you moved, and he moved, and ah...you got a true position, so you knew his true course and speed. If you were doin' in on, what the hell did we call that? It was ah...you know what, what some of that graph paper that, I forget what the hell they call it now...

Andrew

Circular?

Grandpa

Circular graph paper.

Andrew

Huh

Grandpa

I used to, used to have plotting sheets like that. So,

Andrew

Uh huh

Grandpa

It was all, all in degrees and ah...and the you would, you would get his thing, and then you would have to add your vector to it. No...

Andrew

Yeah, so in physics, we do that kind of stuff.

Grandpa

Yeah.

Andrew

But then that only gives you kind of an instantaneous thing, right?

Grandpa

Yeah, yeah, well it's a, you can do a lot with that kind of things too.

Andrew

That's trig to, really, isn't it? Isn't that trig too?

Grandpa

Yeah, it really is. Vector analysis, vector, and that was a special territory, vector analysis. Did you take a course in that?

Andrew

Did what?

Grandpa

Did you ever take a course in that?

Andrew

No well, that, I think that's kind of part of physics, that's basically what I taught in physics.

Grandpa

Yeah, yeah, yeah...Yes. And I had a wise ass officer on the Missouri, gonna' try to trick me...

Andrew

Really?

Grandpa

Yeah, you see, I knew, I knew all about these maneuvers. I was so, I was almost three years workin' on radar, because you know I went to school for sound...and when we put the ship into commission, they were short radar men. And, they were lookin' for volunteers 'cause we had extra sound men. I said "I'll go". Which was...was a lot more interesting. These, these sound men were just sittin' down in the shack by themselves, and just searching, all the time, five degrees at a time, to get a ping on a submarine.

Andrew

Uh huh...

Grandpa

When you got that radar you got everything there...

Andrew

Uh huh

Grandpa

And you're on top of everything. You know, I knew were, everything that was going on...who got movin', all the action and the reactions, and everything else, you know?

Andrew

Because you were high in the ship?

Grandpa

Yeah, oh...that's, that's why we used to call it the combat information center. We had the radar, with all the plots and everything else...

Andrew

Well, I went in it when we went to Hawaii, I've got the picture of getting in that when we went to see it in Hawaii.

Grandpa

Oh, the Miss...

Andrew

On the Missouri, yeah.

Grandpa

The big Missouri, that was about as big as these two rooms put together. I had sixteen men in my, ah...shift. I had that in one watch, sixteen men, mostly seaman and a couple of third class...I was second class. And this guy thought, I was a reserve, so...but I thought something else...So this guy says to me, comes down, this is a commissions officer, wise ass, and he says... "tell me" he says, "we're steamin' along" he says, "and all of a sudden, somebody, spots a torpedo wake, commin' at us from a certain angle. Wha, wha, what's the first thing that you would do?" I said, I said, if that guy is commin' like that, I said that's the first thing I'm going to do, is tell the captain to turn, to get on the same ah...course as the torpedo is. Because, you fire a torpedo, you know, they're not that high speed, torpedos.

Andrew

Yeah.

Grandpa

It's not like shooting a gun.

Andrew

Right

Grandpa

So, so he's on a...when you fire a torpedo, you, your firin' on a ship, and that ship's movin' along, you're firin' the torpedo all the way up here, to meat that, so [makes gestures with his arms].

Andrew

Yeah.

Grandpa

If you turn around, there's...

Andrew

And run parallel...

Grandpa

There's no way their gonna', the torpedo's going to hell someplace, right?

Andrew

Yeah, yeah.

Grandpa

Oh, but he didn't like that, that I knew these things. [laughs] I had an ensign one time, I think he was from Annapolis too, this ensign. And he's going to give everybody a lecture on different things...Around the bridge, you know? Around the, between the radar and the bridge and everything else. This is on the Missouri. He's tryingta, tryingta make ah...point about all these different maneuvers, and oh, about the eh...the turn signals, you know and the signals for left turns and right turns. So he's, he couldn, he got lost. [both laugh] Now, he says "I know, how do you, if you want to have a ninety degree right turn, what signal do you use?" So, your going to have a right turn, you give 'em a turn nine. [laughs] And I know that, and you get a left turn, it's a, it's a nine turn. You know how you can remember that? It's very easy. You got a T [making gestures with his arms] and you got your nine there, and your nine there. So, if you want to make a left turn, you say, turn nine. If you're going to go right, you say nine turn.

Andrew

Un huh...wow, so you went to sound and it...did you have to go back to sonar?

Grandpa

Huh?

Andrew

Did you have to go back to sonar? After radar?

Grandpa

On no, I was happy I didn't have to...that was a boring thing.

Andrew

Yeah, but I mean, well, but I mean did you have to go back to school for the radar then?

Grandpa

Oh, no, no...because you were, sonar and radar, it's just your ah, your ah place of operation is different. Sonar is under the water, and radar is above the water. But, basically, you still searchin' for things. And you're plottin' things. So, but it's applied a little differently, that's all. I mean, you got an education, according to the Navy, the maneuvering and plotting different targets and whatnot, so...that, if you're going from sonar to radar, you know what you're gong to be doin'. So, it's, you're not lost. I was glad I did too, because ah...I was in the middle of everything...I could see, I knew everything that was going on...I mean the sound man would be up in that, eh...sound shack and, in the middle of the night, and he was all alone on his watch, you know? Where as we had two men on the watch. I don't think, I think they had two men on the watch too. Yeah, I think they needed two men, one on the, one would be on the machine, the other would be on the plot. And that's the way they worked on radar. Half hour on and off switch. You know from....because ah...you know being on that scope for half an hour was...

Andrew

Enough.

Grandpa

Enough eye strain.

Andrew

Yeah. So, you went high school, then you went to the Navy, where you went to this sonar school

Grandpa

First I went to great lakes...eh...boot camp.

Andrew

Yeah.

Grandpa

Yeah, that was school too.

Andrew

What was that like?

Grandpa

Well you, like, you learn...oh, a lot of things. Ah...learn a little bit of seamanship, and nomenclature, and ah..God, riflery. And oh, I surprised the hell out of them. This was funny. Half of my company there...the training company, they used to divide them into companies, come from the hillbillies for Tennessee and Kentucky [laughs] the other half of us come from the east coast.

Andrew

Yeah.

Grandpa

So they...eh...they took us one day to the, into this firing range. And, we were firing twenty-two's at targets. [Laughs] I could do it with my eye's closed, almost. [laughs]

Andrew

Yeah.

Grandpa

Well, you saw, I saw, you've seen the sharpshooter targets that I saw there. So, I shot a ninety something. We used to, I think there was about eight firing spaces, or somethin' or maybe more. But anyhow, so many guys, one shot and then oh...I'm standing there listening, and ah...and "Oh that hillbilly with the...number thirteen," or whatever it was...oh, he shot a ninety...I said it was [points to himself], but that's what they were thinking...but I shot the ninety [laughs]. But I was always, I went, I went from sonar school I went to the sub-chaser training center.

Andrew

Yeah, that what I was going to...

Grandpa

And that was still sonar, but it was more, that was, that was up in Miami. We used to go out all the time on little cruises you know, like maneuvers to eh...to train you really. You know, in anti-submarine work. I went to, but that was, that was a lot of classrooms too. Oh, a lot of classroom work about plotting, you know, and all that shit. And it was hot. And the instructors, they would be at the blackboard writing...and he'd look and see guys sleepin' [Andrew laughs]

Grandpa

Zing goes and eraser, or cause, you know, we might have been out the night before drinking beer on Miami beach or someplace, you know? And then you get in the heat, and it was hot down there. This was in the summer I was there. Oh...had no air conditioning. The only place that was air conditioned, I think, was the corner bar [laughs].

Andrew

Interesting.

Grandpa

Yeah, they were on of the first to get air conditioning, and they were one of the first to get television too.

Andrew

Really?

Grandpa

Years ago. Why, because ah...they wanted to get all the drunks, drunkar, the drunkards in there, the drinkers [laughs]. Yeah, so, and the used to have, they used to have, I remember seeing this streamer the used to put outside, you know? "Air Cooled" [laughs].

Andrew

Really?

Grandpa

To encourage them, to come in. But before air conditioning, all those places were hot. You know?

Andrew

So of all the places, in the city, the bars were the first one's to get air conditioning and TV?

Grandpa

Yeah, yeah. [laughs]

Andrew

Pretty interesting...

Grandpa

That's right [laughs]. That was to lure the drinkers to come in.

Andrew

Yeah, anybody to come in, really.

Grandpa

And listen [laughs], ah, one of the Menstretta's, oh, ah...he was related to Bill Menstratta was his uncle. He was my Aunt Mary's brother. But um....he, he was in world war I, he was in one of those battles in, France there. He was in the Army, I think. But anyhow, he used to go down...where you goin' today? They had the, the "Horseshoe Bar" there they used to call it the horseshoe athletic club [Andrew laughs] This was in Woodside, or Historia rather. And, he'd be in there all the time drinkin' beer or whatever. Yeah, Ben Menstretta. So, ah...Fridays...he had a son and a daughter...so for Christmas the bought him a television. So he'd stay home.

Andrew

Oh really?

Grandpa

But he still went down there [both laugh].

Andrew

They're goin' to have to buy him a bar I guess...

Grandpa

Yeah. They always got stories, they always have stories. Oh, the stories they would tell...about how a guys got a free drink [laughs]. Amazing.

Andrew

But he had more than one, that was just the type of story he'd tell?

Grandpa

[Laughs] Oh yeah, but...um...the guy that went to the Irish wake, there's three nights, and there's always a...the whiskey there, and they're always drinkin', and the widow sees these guys every night, come to see her husband, she says now tell me, says "You knew my, my Timmy eh...do you know if he had any preferences where he wanted to be buried or if he wanted to be cremated? Tell me, what do you think?" "Oh" he says, "I think you ought to stuff the old bird and keep the party goin'" [both laugh]. Those were the types of jokes we would have, you know [both laugh]? Guy walks into a bar that's full of flies. [laughs] And he says to the bartender, he says "I'll tell you what, give me a drink and I'll go kill all the flies for you", and he rolls up his newspaper. Oh...he drinks that down. "Boy, that's a lot of flies, you'd better give me another one" [both laugh]. [inaudible] So after he has that drink, he walks out to the door an, and he's got his newspaper, and he says "OK. Send 'em out, one at a time" [both laugh].

Andrew

Now that's kind of funny.

Grandpa

Yeah.

Andrew

Alright. Well, I think that's probably good.

Grandpa

What, what can I tell you? I mean I, I don't really remember high school that much. I, aye, boy...everything was so, so long ago.

Andrew

Yeah. But your favorite teacher was the guy at NYU.

Grandpa

Yeah. Yeah, well that was after the war.

Andrew

How would you compare the military stuff to the guy, to the stuff at NYU? Was it different?

Grandpa

Oh yeah. Yeah, because see, what they did, was...oh...that had guys like Tony, with all this experience. And eh...they were able to teach, and to get things across. They would, they would use 'em for instructors in the schools. Most of these guys were, ah...eh...north Atlantic convoys or they had been in some Pacific actions or whatnot, so they were veterans really. They knew what they were talkin' about. And, so, so you had to listen, you know what I mean?

Andrew

Yeah. Now, was that different, that was different than NYU, or that was...?

Grandpa

Well, no. I'm trying to say these guys were ah...where a experienced ah...personal.

Andrew

Um hum.

Grandpa

'Cause um...To act, you know you're tryin' to train people, you want people that know what they've been doin'. That's why I say, that's why Tony should be so important to them that I wouldn't send him overseas anymore.

Andrew

Oh, Yeah.

Grandpa

Because if you're goin' to train new people, you need men like him. To train 'em.

Andrew

Right.

Grandpa

'Cause they know what they're talkin' about. They've been doin' it, doin' it all these years now.

Andrew

Right.

Grandpa

But um, that what eh...They didn't, they didn't take anybody to...that didn't have good experience to, to teach in those schools. They were enlisted men, the teachers. Maybe third, second class. You know, it all depended. But that's eh...all the instructors were. I guess they had to weed them out too, to make sure they got somebody who was able to put the, put the eh...information across to people.

Andrew

But you think it was different that New York University?

Grandpa

Yeah, because it's like eh...how could you...I don't know what a trade school is like, but it must be like goin' to a trade school. You know what I mean?

Andrew

At, at...in the Army, I mean in the Navy?

Grandpa

Yeah.

Andrew

Yeah.

Grandpa

Because they, because you're goin' just for a specialized thing. See when you go to college you, you...when you go to college you, your still, your doin' all the things in you, in your major plus you, you have a lot of peripheral things you got to do too. Right?

Andrew

Right. But were the, where the classrooms and teachers different? Or was just with the content?

Grandpa

Well the...you, you were concentrating when you, when you for instance, to the sonar school, you were just concentrating on all that, that eh...sonar work, you know what I mean? I mean there's all ah...that's the first time I ever heard of doppler. You know of doppler?

Andrew

Yeah, doppler, like the radar...

Grandpa

You know what doppler means, don't you?

Andrew

Doppler radar [inaudible]

Grandpa

Doppler is a change in frequency, eh...so it was very important in submarine work. You would, you would have to tell 'em if it was up doppler or down doppler, if you had a good tone ear...which I didn't have too good of. But, as eh...as you, as you close in on a submarine, and he's comin' towards you, eh...it's gonna increase the frequency because ah...because the sound waves are hittin' that, and their, and it's closin' and their closin', the waves. If he's going' away from you, it's eh...

Andrew

Yeah.

Grandpa

It's ah...increasin' the frequency. I mean decreasing the frequency.

Andrew

Yeah. It's spreading it out.

Grandpa

Yeah.

Andrew

Huh.

Grandpa

That's what doppler is.

Andrew

So when they say doppler radar, what do they mean?

Grandpa

They must mean the same thing [laughs]. That's how they, that's how their figurin' the...but I had a guy stop me one time [inaudible], you know, the only ticket I ever got for speedin'...comin', comin' down the hill to Village Motors, on a, on a Sunday night there [laughs]. I was goin' to the hospital to see your grandmother.

Andrew

Uh huh...

Grandpa

And, uh...he was sittin' at the bottom of the hill, by Village Motors, I was comin' down the hill

Andrew

Oh, and you gave him the doppler speech?

Grandpa

[Laughs] Yeah. I asked him what, when was the last time he calibrated it, you know [both laugh]? Oh God, he gets a tunin' fork out [chuckles]. "It's perfect" he says. I couldn't tell anyway [laughs].

Andrew

Yeah.

Grandpa

I think he, he probably though, they were, they like to set these speed traps down in Millersburg.

Andrew

Yeah.

Grandpa

That's why a radar detector's a good thing.

Grandpa

Yeah, but that...[chuckles]. If I, I didn't stop, you know...I, I, I was all the way up to the hospital when I saw the lights flashin' behind me. I just kept goin' and parked. And he pulls up behind me and blocks my parkin' space [laughs]. If I knew that was gonna happen I would have went around the hospital and went out the back way [both laugh].

Andrew

OK. Well, I think I'm going to go.

Grandpa

Yeah, but...I wish I could help you more but...

Andrew

No, that's all I need, I don't need more...

Grandpa

You know, because, don't forget, all that time I spent in the Navy made a greater impression on me than anything else. You know?

Andrew

Why's that?

Grandpa

Because, eh...the intensity of it, and whatnot, you're always...you never knew from one day to the next what was going to happen. It was always somethin'.

Andrew

Well, did you come out of the Navy more ready, or eager to learn? Or no?

Grandpa

Uh...

Andrew

Or is it just like that's sort of a dividing line?

Grandpa

Let's put it this way. Before the war I was gonna go to Georgia Tech for the eh...Guggisheim School of Aeronautics. And eh, after the war I was so involved with radar, I used to fool around with the technicians, you know, on the...I really got interested in the, the electronics and whatnot, and electricity. So, I decided that's what I wanted to do, instead of uh...eh...aerodynamics. And, and I said boy, I cou...I wanna live home.

Andrew

Yeah.

Grandpa

I've been away for three years. I wanna live home.

Andrew

Yeah.

Grandpa

Which I did. So, so I lived home and ah...I traveled back and forth. But eh...jeez, I got a, I got a thirty seven Packet, this was in 1946, a thirty seven Packet, all beat up...my father, knew a blacksmith...that we, that we bought it off.

Andrew

A blacksmith?

Grandpa

Yeah [laughs]. A blacksmith, yeah, down in the east side of Manhattan. And, what the hell was that

6 Consent Forms

What Remains: Middle aged adults' recollection of what was learned in high school and their perceptions as to why those memories endure.

I want to do research on what people remember learning in high school. I want to do this because I believe that there is an inordinate degree of focus on exposure content, much of which is rendered inaccessible to individuals after moving on to other topics. It is my belief that the in-depth analysis of content, whatever its nature, should be the focus of schooling, rather than the acquisition of knowledge. I would like you to take part in this project. If you decide to do this, you will be asked to describe your high school experiences, including what you remember learning and the context within which that learning occurred. This description will be given in an interview setting, which will be recorded, and should take between thirty and ninety minutes. Additionally, you will be asked to aid in the evaluation of your contribution as the study progresses. The entire process is estimated to take place over a three week period.

Your contributions are central to the success of this study. Your identity, however, is not required. Hence, your identity will be masked through the use of a different name (a pseudonym). Information that is provided will be shared only with my advisory committee, and when shared this alternative name will be used. Additionally, you will be participating in checking the accuracy of my analysis, and thus be able to comment on the degree to which this masking is present. My goal is to be as transparent as possible with all participants, but to be guarded with all information collected throughout the course of this study.

If you take part in this project you will be contributing to the body of knowledge that is used to shape the way our public schools function. Personal benefits, related to the requisite reflective exercise, might be used in your interaction with relatives, e.g., you children or grandchildren. Additionally, insight gained from the analysis might be applied to your interaction with public schools in general. Taking part in this project is entirely up to you, and no one will hold it against you if you decide not to do it. If you do take part, you may stop at any time.

If you want to know more about this research project, please call me at 330.231.5332. The project has been approved by Kent State University. If you have questions about Kent State University's rules for research, please call Dr. John West, Vice President of Research, Division of Research and Graduate Studies (Tel. 330.672.2704).

You will get a copy of this consent form.

Sincerely,

Andrew J. Cerniglia, Doctoral Student - Kent State University

Consent Statements

I agree to to take part in this study. I know what I will have to do and that I can stop at any time.

Signature

Date

Waiver or Alteration of Informed Consent

Informed consent assures that participants understand the nature of the research and can knowledgeably and voluntarily decide whether or not to participate. The basic elements of informed consent (e.g., explanation of the study's purpose, description of foreseeable risks and benefits, description of the extent to which confidentiality will be maintained, explanation of whom to contact with questions, statement that participation is voluntary and may be discontinued at any time, etc.) are outlined in federal guidelines (Title 45, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 46). In rare instances, the guidelines allow IRBs to approve a consent procedure that does not include, or alters, some of the elements of informed consent. To request an approval for a waiver or alteration of informed consent, the investigator must document that the proposed study meets the following criteria:

- I. The research involves no more than minimal risk to participants;
- II. The waiver or alteration will not adversely affect the rights and welfare of participants;
- III. The research could not practicably be carried out without the waiver or alteration (e.g., some research on child abuse and neglect or on runaway teens could not be carried out without a waiver of parental consent).
- IV. Whenever appropriate, the participants will be provided with additional pertinent information after they have participated in the study.

Waivers cannot be granted because the investigator lacks the resources (e.g., personnel, time, money) needed to obtain informed consent. In most instances, granting a waiver of informed consent involves full board review.

Passive Consent

Passive consent is when parents are sent a letter explaining the research and are told that unless they return the letter the child will be enrolled in the study. This is different from a waiver because parents are notified about the research through a letter. The Board's concern with this type of consent is that there is no guarantee that parents see the letter. Unless justification beyond inconvenience is provided, passive consent will not be allowed.

Audio Consent Form

I agree to audio taping at _____ on _____.

Signature

Date

I have been told that I have the right to hear the audio tapes before they are used. I have decided that I:

_____ want to hear the tapes _____ do not want to hear the tapes

Sign now below if you do not want to hear the tapes. If you want to hear the tapes, you will be asked to sign after hearing them.

Andrew J. Cerniglia and other researchers approved by Kent State University may / may not use the tapes made of me. The original tapes or copies may be used for:

_____ this research project _____ teacher education _____ presentation at professional meetings

Signature

Date

Address:

References

- Aguinaldo, J. P. (2004, March). Rethinking validity in qualitative research from a social constructionist perspective: From "is this valid research?" to "what is this research valid for?". *The Qualitative Report*, 9(1), 127-136.
- Anderson, D., Shimizu, H. (2007). Recollections of expo 70: Visitors' experiences and the retention of vivid long-term memories. *Curator*, 50(4), 435-454.
- Brown, S. C., Stevens, J., Richard A., Troiano, P. F., Schneider, M. K. (2002). Exploring complex phenomena: Grounded theory in student affairs research. *Journal of College Student Development*, 43(2), 173-83.
- Bruning, R. H., Schraw, G. J., Norby, M. M., Ronning, R. R. (2004). *Cognitive psychology and instruction* (Fourth ed.). Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Creswell, J. W. (2006). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* [with cd-rom]. second edition. SAGE Publications.
- Creswell, J. W., Miller, D. L. (2000). Determining validity in qualitative inquiry. *Theory into Practice*, 39(3), 124-30.
- Ericsson, K. A., Roring, R. W., Nandagopal, K. (2007). Giftedness and evidence for reproducibly superior performance: an account based on the expert performance framework. *High Ability Studies*, 18(1), 3-56.
- Gilman, R., Anderman, E. M. (2006, October). The relationship between relative levels of motivation and intrapersonal, interpersonal, and academic functioning among older adolescents. *Journal of School Psychology*, 44(5), 375-391.
- Gladwell, M. (2005). *Blink: The power of thinking without thinking*. Little, Brown Jug Company.
- Glaser, B. G., Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. AldineTransaction.
- Goulding, C. (1998). Grounded theory: The missing methodology on the interpretivist agenda. *Quantitative Market Research: An International Journal*, 1(1), 50-57.
- Greene, M. (1994). Epistemology and educational research: The influence of recent approaches to knowledge. *Review of Research in Education*, 20, 423-464.
- Hostetler, K., Macintyre Latta, M. A., Sarroub, L. K. (2007). Retrieving meaning in teacher education: The question of being. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 58(3), 231-244.
- Howe, K. R. (1988). Against the quantitative-qualitative incompatibility thesis or dogmas die hard. *Educational Researcher*, 17(8), 10-16.
- Iverson, S. V. (2008). Capitalizing on change: The discursive framing of diversity in u.s. land-grant universities. *Equity Excellence in Education*, 41(2), 182-199.
- Kalyuga, S., Ayres, P., Chandler, P., Sweller, J. (2003). The expertise reversal effect. *Educational Psychologist*, 38(1), 23-31.
- LaBoskey, V. K. (2007). The methodology of self-study and its theoretical under-

- pinnings. In *International handbook of self-study of teaching and teacher education practices* (pp. 817-869). Springer.
- Marshall, M. N. (1996). Sampling for qualitative research. *Family Practice*, 13(6), 522-526.
- Ormrod, J. E. (2008). *Human learning*. Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Peshkin, A. (1988). In search of subjectivity—one's own. *Educational Researcher*, 17(7), 17-21.
- Rabiee, F. (2004). Focus-group interview and data analysis. *Proceedings of the Nutrition Society*, 63, 655-660.
- Rogoff, B. (1991). *Apprenticeship in thinking: Cognitive development in social context*. Oxford University Press.
- Rovai, A., Ponton, M., Wighting, M., Baker, J. (2007). A comparative analysis of student motivation in traditional classroom and e-learning courses. *International Journal on E-Learning*, 6(3), 413-432.
- Sadler-Smith, E., Riding, R. (1999). Cognitive style and instructional preferences. *Instructional Science*, 27(5), 355-371.
- Sixsmith, J., Murray, C. D. (2001, May). Ethical issues in the documentary data analysis of internet posts and archives. *Qualitative Health Research*, 11(3), 423-432.
- Spaniol, J., Madden, D. J., Voss, A. (2006). A diffusion model analysis of adult age differences in episodic and semantic long-term memory retrieval. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 32(1), 101-117.
- Sweller, J., Merriënboer, J. J. G. van, Paas, F. G. W. C. (1998). Cognitive architecture and instructional design. *Educational Psychology Review*, 10(3), 251-296.
- Vansteenkiste, M., Lens, W., Deci, E. L. (2006). Intrinsic versus extrinsic goal contents in self-determination theory: Another look at the quality of academic motivation. *Educational Psychologist*, 41(1), 19-31.
- Young, M. R. (2005). The motivational effects of the classroom environment in facilitating self-regulated learning. *Journal of Marketing Education*, 27(1), 25-40.