

## Contents

1	Course Description .....	2
2	Learning Outcomes.....	2
3	Required Course Material.....	2
4	Evaluation and Grading .....	3
4.1	Formatting Guidelines for Weekly Assignments and Research Paper.....	4
4.2	Weekly Assignments .....	4
4.3	revi .....	4
4.4	Research Paper.....	4
4.4.1	Guidelines for Writing the Research Proposal/Paper .....	5
5	Academic Honesty.....	6
6	Tentative Schedule with Weekly Topics and Readings.....	8
7	Lynda King Case Description.....	15
7.1	Questions to Develop Your Week 1 Memo:.....	16

# CIS 84000: Qualitative Research in Information Systems<sup>1</sup>

<b>Instructor:</b> Radhika Jain	<b>Class Meeting Time:</b> Mondays 1pm-3pm
<b>Email:</b> radhika.jain@baruch.cuny.edu	<b>Office Hours:</b> Mondays 3-4pm

## 1 Course Description

This course is designed as an introductory seminar on qualitative research in the field of business, and in particular, Information Systems. The course balances the acquisition of basic knowledge about the conduct of qualitative research with the application of that knowledge to business research.

The course introduces the student to various qualitative research approaches, with a focus on case study research, action research, ethnographic research, and grounded theory. We will also cover several data collection techniques widely used in qualitative research, such as interviews, participant observation, focus groups, fieldwork, and using internet communications and social media. Students are introduced to data coding methods, memo writing, theoretical sampling, data presentation, and the use of qualitative data analysis software. Perspectives on what it means to draw conclusions and build theory from qualitative data are explored. We will conclude with guidance on writing and publishing qualitative work.

## 2 Learning Outcomes

After completing this course, students will be able to ...

- Understand the basic philosophical assumptions, principles, aims, techniques, and appropriate uses of the major, specific qualitative research methods.
- Articulate the key facets of different types of qualitative research methods, data collection, and analysis strategies.
- Assess the contributions of business research that employ qualitative research methods.
- Identify research problems that can be addressed with a qualitative research study.
- Design and conduct an independent qualitative study of an original research question that produces credible findings.
- Develop and execute effective qualitative data collection strategies.
- Use computer assisted qualitative data analysis software to analyze and built theory from qualitative data.
- Write up a research report that effectively communicates the findings of a qualitative study to different audiences.

## 3 Required Course Material

1. Jennifer Mason, "Qualitative Researching", 3<sup>rd</sup> Ed, Sage Publications. Newbury Park, CA, 2018
  - a. Online link to purchase: <https://www.vitalsource.com/referral?term=9781526422019>
2. Miles, M.B. and Huberman, A.M. Qualitative Data Analysis: An Expanded Sourcebook, 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed, Sage Publications, Newbury Park, CA, 1994.

---

<sup>1</sup> Syllabus presented here is adapted from Prof. Karl Lang's qualitative seminar offered in 2018 at Baruch College and Prof. Daniel Robey's qualitative seminar offered in 2010 at Georgia State University

- a. Note: You can search for the copyright free version of the 2nd edition online.
- 3. Michael D Myers, “Qualitative Research in Business and Management”, 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition.
  - a. Note: We will be relying on the PowerPoint slides that come with the book for quick overview of weekly topics. You do not need to purchase the book if you do not wish to. Link to slides: [https://study.sagepub.com/system/files/powerpoint\\_slides\\_3.zip](https://study.sagepub.com/system/files/powerpoint_slides_3.zip)
- 4. Additional readings will be made available separately.

## 4 Evaluation and Grading

Students are evaluated on their participation in class, preparation of a weekly memos and/or assignments, preparation of a research paper, and a written review of a classmate’s proposal and/or an actual paper to be assigned.

All students are expected to come to class ready to discuss all the papers critically. Some examples of what all students in the class should be ready to discuss at all times include:

1. What is the main theoretical basis for the study?
2. What are main philosophical assumptions of the paper? Sometimes these may be stated explicitly, other times you will need to infer based on your reading of research methodology. Is there an alignment between the assumptions and the research methodology?
3. Describe the research design. Are there any limitations? Do you have alternative suggestions that would answer the same research questions?
4. Are the data collection and analysis strategies sufficient? As a reader, are you able to trace how authors analyzed and coded the data to support their findings?
5. What are the main theoretical contributions? Are there any additional ones? Is the contribution significant enough?

Performance on various deliverables is weighted as follows:

Component	Weight
Assignments (weekly memos and additional practice exercises as needed)	25%
Active class participation	20%
Research Proposal/Paper	30%
Reviewing classmate’s research proposal/paper	10%
Review of a qualitative paper	15%

Final course grade will be calculated on the following basis:

A	100% – 93.0%
A-	92.9% – 90.0%
B+	89.9% – 87.1%
B	87.0% – 83.0%
B-	82.9% – 80.0%
C+	79.9% – 77.1%
C	77.0% – 73.0%
C-	72.9% – 70.0%
F	69.9% and below

#### 4.1 Formatting Guidelines for Weekly Assignments and Research Paper

Write using font Times New Roman, 11 or 12 font size, single-spaced, with 6-8 point spacing between each paragraph. Please use numbered paragraph styles, bullet points, tables, and figures extensively to organize your writing just as is done in this syllabus.

For weekly memos, please include week#, your name, and page numbers in the document footer.

For the research paper, be sure to include the title page that has the title of the paper, author, affiliation, abstract of no more than 200 words, and keywords.

#### 4.2 Weekly Assignments

In addition to having read all the papers for the week and be ready to discuss them, students will also be given individual weekly memo assignments.

Your weekly memos are due each week by Sunday 8:30pm. Please 'drop' them to Google Drive folder that I have shared so that we can easily access and review. Any late or in-class submission will receive a penalty of 50% as we all need time to briefly review them before the class.

To facilitate a productive discourse of assigned articles, please adhere to the following guidelines in developing your memos **except for the Week 1 memo. See the schedule page as well as last section of the syllabus for the week 1 memo.**

1. Part I [one-page, single spaced]: Writeup for part I reflects and summarizes the key points made in the readings assigned for the week that are relevant to the weekly topic and present them in an organized and integrated fashion.
  - a. It is important that you point out commonalities and differences among the different authors in terms of assumptions, perspectives, and purposes of their writings.
  - b. Make sure you have clearly identified and cited each reading in your writeup of this section.
2. Part II: Each week, one student will be assigned one paper to present to the class. The student is responsible for preparing and presenting a very quick summary of the paper and a more thorough critical review of it using the guidelines below. The presentation should be a maximum of 20 minutes.
  - a. What is the research question addressed in the paper?
  - b. What are ontological and epistemological assumptions of the paper? If they are not stated explicitly, based on your reading of the paper make an educated guess to identify them.
  - c. What research method is being used to address the research question posed? Be sure to discuss:
    - i. the strengths of the authors' use of the qualitative methods
    - ii. the weaknesses of the article with respect to the qualitative methods used
    - iii. ways by which authors can improve use of the qualitative methods based on the core readings.
  - d. What is the main theoretical contribution of the paper? Briefly discuss.
  - e. Describe one thing in the paper/study that you thought was interesting/intriguing/different and explain why you thought so.
  - f. Provide one suggestion of how another researcher (such as yourself) could create a new research study based on one or more of the contributions of the paper.
  - g. What did you not understand from the paper? List any major questions you may have and we'll try to answer them in class.

#### 4.3 Research Paper

This is an individual project that consists of preparing, conducting, analyzing, and writing up a qualitative research study. You will present your paper at the end of the semester. You can pick a topic that is of interest to you and will allow you to easily collect data through interviews, observation, or online forums.

The topic of the research paper though must be approved by me in advance.

The paper will have a specific research question, motivation, background literature review, research method, (data collection/analysis strategy to be used), expected findings, and potential theoretical and practical contributions. Follow the “Guidelines for Writing the Research Proposal”, provided below. Please use the below due dates to pace ourselves and deliver various milestones. The final version of the paper will be due **by May 22<sup>nd</sup> at midnight**. Late submissions will not be accepted.

Table 1: deliverables

Milestones	Deliverable	Due by
Introduction and motivation, research question	Written document via BB	Wed, Feb 22 <sup>nd</sup>
Literature review, theoretical basis, methodology draft, and data collection plan	Written document via BB	Tues, Mar 28 <sup>th</sup>
Data collection planned during spring break		Apr 5-13 <sup>th</sup>
Report back on initial data collection	5 minute in-class presentation	Mon, Apr 17 <sup>th</sup>
Update the draft with the analysis and findings and earlier sections as needed.	Written document via BB	Tues, May 9 <sup>th</sup>
Submit a review of a classmate’s proposal	Written document via BB	Tues, May 16 <sup>th</sup>
In-class presentation and Final paper due	20 min presentation and final submission via BB	Mon, May 22 <sup>nd</sup>

#### 4.3.1 Guidelines for Writing the Research Proposal/Paper

To help with this objective, the proposal should be structured into the following sections (note the suggested page lengths).

1. Introduction and Motivation – statement of the problem motivating your research and its relevance to practice. (1 page)
2. Research question/objective – This should be a clearly formed research question or objective statement. Ideally this is part of the Introduction section itself (1-2 sentences!)
3. Background literature review – statement of the research gap --- theoretical or practical or methodological) that your research will aim to bridge (2 pages).
4. Theoretical Basis – statement of the basic ontological and epistemological assumptions underlying the inquiry. How do you construe reality? What will count as evidence of that reality? Are you proceeding inductively or deductively? Are you testing or extending existing theory, building new theory, or a-theoretically explore some novel questions? (1½ pages)
5. Methodology – statement of the research methods. What type of qualitative research tradition are you following (e.g., case study, ethnography, action research, mixed method, or grounded theory)? Articulate your research design, your methods for collecting or generating data, and your methods for data analysis. Offer a brief sample of initial analysis derived from the data. (3-4 pages)
6. Findings– Articulate your analysis in detail providing rich insight through the quotes from data as an evidence. (2-3 pages)

7. Expected Contributions, Limitations, and Future Research - Statement of the expected value of your findings in relation to the issues posed in the Introduction and research question. You need to identify both scholarly and practitioner contributions of your work. What are the shortcomings of your current research work, how would you or someone who does a follow up to your research, address them? (1-2 pages)
8. References – inclusion of complete references for all works cited in your proposal (as needed)

The easiest and quickest way to identify your topic of interest would be browsing through some recent CFPs for ICIS. For example, here is the link to ICIS 2023 track descriptions:

<https://icis2023.aisconferences.org/track-descriptions/> Some ideas include but are not limited to:

1. Emergent/evolving content production using digital platforms
2. AI, Autonomous Applications, and Human Interaction
3. Transformation through analytics (at Individual e.g. personal care or Organizational level)
4. Digital Technologies and the Future of Work
5. Individual use of AI-enabled healthcare (e.g. by patients or healthcare providers such as doctors and nurses)
6. Dark side of IT
7. Societal Impact of IS
8. Sharing Economy, Platforms, and Crowds

## 5 Academic Honesty

I fully support Baruch College's policy on Academic Honesty, which states:

“Academic dishonesty is unacceptable and will not be tolerated. Cheating, forgery, plagiarism and collusion in dishonest acts undermine the college's educational mission and the students' personal and intellectual growth. Baruch students are expected to bear individual responsibility for their work, to learn the rules and definitions that underlie the practice of academic integrity, and to uphold its ideals. Ignorance of the rules is not an acceptable excuse for disobeying them. Any student who attempts to compromise or devalue the academic process will be sanctioned.”

"The use of artificial intelligence (AI) is strictly prohibited in all coursework and assignments. This includes, but is not limited to, the use of AI-generated text, speech, or images, as well as the use of AI tools or software to complete any portion of a project or assignment. Any violations of this policy will result in disciplinary action, up to and including a failing grade for the assignment or course. Our goal is to encourage critical thinking and creativity, and the use of AI detracts from this objective. Students are expected to use their own knowledge, research and analysis to complete coursework."

You are responsible for familiarizing yourself with the information on academic honesty presented on the College's website. Please visit [http://www.baruch.cuny.edu/academic/academic\\_honesty.html](http://www.baruch.cuny.edu/academic/academic_honesty.html) and read this information carefully. Also, each student is required to complete the online plagiarism tutorial at <http://newman.baruch.cuny.edu/help/plagiarism/default.htm>. Please note that the “quiz” that the tutorial refers to is not available online anymore and does not need to be completed.

I reserve the right to use TurnItIn or similar service for one or more deliverables of the course on an ad hoc basis to assess for plagiarism. My policy is to give a failing grade to any assignment that has been plagiarized (even in part) or an exercise or exam in which you have cheated. Similarly, students who falsify attendance records for themselves or others will receive a grade of 0%. In addition, I am required by College policy to submit a report of suspected academic dishonesty to the Office of the Dean of Students. This report would become part of your permanent file.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

## 6 Tentative Schedule with Weekly Topics and Readings.

- Generally speaking, the readings in blue indicate core methods readings and the readings in black are exemplar empirical works or papers that exemplify/elaborate on core concepts

Module I: Designing Qualitative Research		
1. Jan 30 <sup>th</sup>	The case for qualitative research	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <a href="#">Mason: Ch. 1.</a></li> <li>2. <a href="#">Myers: Ch. 2 and 3</a></li> <li>3. <a href="#">Sarker, Suprateek; Xiao, Xiao; Beaulieu, Tanya; and Lee, Allen S. (2018) "Learning from First-Generation Qualitative Approaches in the IS Discipline: An Evolutionary View and Some Implications for Authors and Evaluators (Part 1)," Journal of the Association for Information Systems, 19(9).</a></li> <li>4. <a href="#">Sarker, Suprateek; Xiao, Xiao; Beaulieu, Tanya; and Lee, Allen S. (2018) "Learning from First-Generation Qualitative Approaches in the IS Discipline: An Evolutionary View and Some Implications for Authors and Evaluators (Part 2)," Journal of the Association for Information Systems, 19(9).</a></li> <li>5. Lynda King Case [ALL students to prepare the memo. See the case at the end of the syllabus].</li> </ol> <p><b>Optional</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6. <a href="#">Robert Gephart, "Qualitative Research and the Academy of Management Journal", Academy of Management Journal, 2004, Vol. 47, No. 4, 454-462.</a></li> </ol>
2. Feb 6 <sup>th</sup>	Philosophical foundations	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <a href="#">Myers: Ch. 4</a></li> <li>2. <a href="#">Orlikowski, Wanda J., and Jack J. Baroudi, "Studying Information Technology in Organizations: Research Approaches and Assumptions," <i>Information Systems Research</i>, 2 (1), 1991, 1-28. [Setareh]</a></li> <li>3. <a href="#">Dubé, Line, and Guy Paré, "Rigor in Information Systems Positivist Case Research: Current Practices, Trends, and Recommendations," <i>MIS Quarterly</i>, 27 (4), 2003, 597-635. [Zhaoyi]</a></li> <li>4. <a href="#">Klein, Heinz K. and Michael D. Myers, "A Set of Principles for Conducting and Evaluating Interpretive Field Studies in Information Systems," <i>MIS Quarterly</i>, 23 (1), 1999, 67-93. [Fan]</a></li> <li>5. <a href="#">Mingers, John, "Real-izing Information Systems: Critical Realism as an Underpinning Philosophy for Information Systems," <i>Information and Organization</i>, 14 (2), 2004, 87-103. [Yiming]</a></li> </ol>
Feb 13 <sup>th</sup>	College Closed	
Feb 20 <sup>th</sup>	College Closed	
3. Feb 21 <sup>st</sup> (Tues)	Designing qualitative research and ethics	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <a href="#">Mason: Ch. 2 &amp; 4.</a></li> <li>2. <a href="#">Myers: Ch. 5</a></li> <li>3. <a href="#">Sherif, Karma, Robert W. Zmud, and Glenn J. Browne, "Managing Peer-To-Peer Conflicts in Disruptive Information Technology Innovations: The Case of Software Reuse," <i>MIS Quarterly</i>, 30 (2), 2006, 339-356. [Yiming]</a></li> <li>4. <a href="#">Prasad, Pushkala, and Anshuman Prasad, "Stretching the Iron Cage: The Constitution and Implications of Routine Workplace Resistance," <i>Organization Science</i>, 11 (4), 2000, 387-403. [Setareh]</a></li> </ol>



		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. Bygstad, Bendik, “Generative Mechanisms for Innovation in Information Infrastructures,” <i>Information and Organization</i>, 20 (3-4), 2010, 156-168 [Fan]</li> <li>6. Martin, Joanne, Kathleen Knopoff, and Christine Beckman, “An Alternative to Bureaucratic Impersonality and Emotional Labor: Bounded Emotionality at The Body Shop,” <i>Administrative Science Quarterly</i>, 43 (1998), 429-469. [Zhaoyi]</li> </ol>
<b>Module II: Qualitative Data Collection/Generation</b>		
4. Feb 27 <sup>th</sup>	Interviewing	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <a href="#">Mason, Ch 3 &amp; 5.</a></li> <li>2. <a href="#">Myers, Ch. 10</a></li> <li>3. Myers, Michael D., and Michael Newman, “The Qualitative Interview in IS Research: Examining the Craft,” <i>Information and Organization</i>, 17 (1), 2007, 2-26. [Yiming]</li> <li>4. Schultze, U., Michel A., “Designing interviews to generate rich data for information systems research, <i>Information and Organization</i>, 21(1), January 2011, 1-16 [Setareh/Zhaoyi]</li> <li>5. Meho, Lokman I., “E-Mail Interviews in Qualitative Research: A Methodological Discussion,” <i>Journal of the American Society for information Science and Technology</i>,” 1284-1295. [Fan]</li> </ol>
5. Mar 6 <sup>th</sup>	Participation and observation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <a href="#">Mason, Ch 6.</a></li> <li>2. <a href="#">Myers, Ch. 11</a></li> <li>3. Howard-Grenville, Jennifer A., “The Persistence of Flexible Organizational Routines: The Role of Agency and Organizational Context,” <i>Organization Science</i>, 16 (6) 2005, 618-636. [Yiming]</li> <li>4. Jin, Leigh, and Daniel Robey, “Bridging Social and Technical Interfaces in Organizations: An Interpretive Analysis of Time-Space Distanciation,” <i>Information and Organization</i>, 18 (3) 2008, 177-204. [Fan/Zhaoyi]</li> <li>5. Puri, Satish K., “Integrating Scientific with Indigenous Knowledge: Constructing Knowledge Alliances for Land Management in India, <i>MIS Quarterly</i>, 31 (2) 2007, 355-379. [Setareh]</li> </ol>
<b>Module III: Strategies for Qualitative Research</b>		
6. Mar 13 <sup>th</sup>	Case study	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <a href="#">Miles and Huberman, Chs. 2-3.</a></li> <li>2. <a href="#">Myers Ch. 7</a></li> <li>3. Eisenhardt, Kathleen M., “Building Theories from Case Study Research,” <i>Academy of Management Review</i>, 14 (4), 1989, 532-550.</li> <li>4. Eisenhardt, Kathleen M., and Melissa E. Graebner, “Theory Building from Cases: Opportunities and Challenges,” <i>Academy of Management Journal</i>, 50 (1) 2007, 25-32. [Zhaoyi: Both Eisenhardt papers]</li> <li>5. Robey, Daniel, and Michael Newman, "Sequential Patterns in Information Systems Development: An Application of a Social Process Model," <i>ACM Transactions on Information Systems</i>, 14, 1996, 30-63. [Setareh]</li> <li>6. Bernardi R, Sarker S, Sahay S. The Role of Affordances in the Deinstitutionalization of a Dysfunctional Health Management Information System in Kenya: An Identity Work Perspective. <i>MIS Quarterly</i>. 2019;43(4):1177-1200. [Fan]</li> <li>7. Maruping, Likoebe M., Matook, Sabine, The Multiplex Nature of the</li> </ol>

		Customer Representative Role in Agile Information Systems Development., MIS Quarterly, Sep 2020, 44:3, 1411-1437 [Yiming]
7. Mar 20 <sup>th</sup>	Grounded Theory	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Myers, Ch. 9;</li> <li>2. Suddaby, Roy, "What Grounded Theory is Not," <i>Academy of Management Journal</i>, 49 (4) 2006, 633-643.</li> <li>3. Orlikowski, Wanda J., "CASE Tools as Organizational Change: Investigating Incremental and Radical Changes in Systems Development," <i>MIS Quarterly</i>, 17 (3), 1993, 309-340. [Setareh]</li> <li>4. Gerlach, Jin P.; Cenfetelli, Ronald T., Constant Checking is not Addiction: A Grounded Theory of IT-Mediated State-Tracking, <i>MIS Quarterly</i>, Dec 2020, 44:4, 1705-1731. [Yiming]</li> <li>5. Möhlmann, Mareike; Zalmanson, Lior; Henfridsson, Ola; and Gregory, Robert W.. 2021. "Algorithmic Management of Work on Online Labor Platforms: When Matching Meets Control," <i>MIS Quarterly</i>, (45: 4) pp.1999-2022. [Zhaoyi]</li> <li>6. Emmanuelle Vaast, Alain Pinsonneault, Dealing with the Social Media Polycontextuality of Work. <i>Information Systems Research</i>, 2022, 33(4):1428-1451. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1287/isre.2022.1103">https://doi.org/10.1287/isre.2022.1103</a> [Fan]</li> </ol> <p><b>Optional</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>7. Vaast, E., &amp; Walsham, G. (2013). "Grounded Theorizing for Electronically Mediated Social Contexts," <i>European Journal of Information Systems</i>, 22(1), 9-25.</li> <li>8. Nicholas Berente, Stefan Seidel, Hani Safadi, 2019, "Research Commentary—Data-Driven Computationally Intensive Theory Development", <i>Information Systems Research</i> Vol. 30, No. 1</li> </ol>
8. Mar 27 <sup>th</sup>	Ethnography	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Myers, Ch. 8;</li> <li>2. Callen Anthony, Beth A. Bechky, Anne-Laure Fayard, "Collaborating" with AI: Taking a System View to Explore the Future of Work. <i>Organization Science</i>, 2023</li> <li>3. Barley, Stephen R., "Images of Imaging: Notes on Doing Longitudinal Field Work," <i>Organization Science</i>, 1 (3), August 1990, 220-245. [Fan]</li> <li>4. Niki A. den Nieuwenboer, João Vieira da Cunha, Linda Klebe Treviño, Middle Managers and Corruptive Routine Translation: The Social Production of Deceptive Performance. 2017, <i>Organization Science</i> 28(5):781-803. [Zhaoyi]</li> <li>5. Beane, M. Shadow Learning: Building Robotic Surgical Skill When Approved Means Fail. <i>Administrative Science Quarterly</i>, 2019, 64(1), 87–123. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1177/0001839217751692">https://doi.org/10.1177/0001839217751692</a> [Setareh]</li> <li>6. van den Broek, E., Sergeeva, A., &amp; Huysman, M. (2021). When the machine meets the expert: An ethnography of developing AI for hiring. <i>MIS Quarterly</i>, 45(3), 1557-1580. [Yiming] <a href="https://doi.org/10.25300/MISQ/2021/16559">https://doi.org/10.25300/MISQ/2021/16559</a></li> </ol> <p><b>Optional:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>7. Perkmann, M and Spicer, A (2014)., "How Emerging Organizations Take Form: The Role of Imprinting and Values in Organizational Bricolage", <i>Organization Science</i>, 25(6), 1785-1806</li> <li>8. Ulrike Schultze, "A Confessional Account of an Ethnography about</li> </ol>

		<p>Knowledge Work”, MIS Quarterly, Mar 2000, 24(1), pp. 3-41</p> <p>9. Cramton, C.D., &amp; Hinds, P.J. (2014). “An Embedded Model of Cultural Adaptation in Global Teams, Organization Science, 25(4), 1056-1081.</p> <p>10. Karen Golden-Biddle and Karen Locke, “Appealing Work: An Investigation of How Ethnographic Texts Convince”, Organization Science, 4(4), November 1993</p>
9. Apr 3 <sup>rd</sup>	Mixed/Multi-method	<p><b>Guest speaker: Sumantra Sarkar, Associate Professor, SUNY Binghamton</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Viswanath Venkatesh, Susan A. Brown and Hillol Bala, “Bridging the Qualitative-Quantitative Divide: Guidelines for Conducting Mixed Methods Research in Information Systems”, MIS Quarterly, March 2013, Vol. 37, No. 1, pp. 21-54</li> <li>2. Sabherwal, R., &amp; Robey, D. (1995). Reconciling Variance and Process Strategies for Studying Information System Development. Information Systems Research, 6(4), 303–327. [Yiming]</li> <li>3. Julia Bauer, Nikolaus Franke, Philipp Tuertscher (2016), “Intellectual Property Norms in Online Communities: How User-Organized Intellectual Property Regulation Supports Innovation”, Information Systems Research, 27(4) [Fan]</li> <li>4. Sumantra Sarkar, Anthony Vance, Balasubramaniam Ramesh, Menelaos Demestihias, Daniel Thomas Wu (2020) The Influence of Professional Subculture on Information Security Policy Violations: A Field Study in a Healthcare Context. Information Systems Research 31(4):1240-1259. <a href="https://doi.org.remote.baruch.cuny.edu/10.1287/isre.2020.0941">https://doi-org.remote.baruch.cuny.edu/10.1287/isre.2020.0941</a> [Zhaoyi]</li> <li>5. Monideepa Tarafdar, Deepa Kajal Ray (2021) Role of Social Media in Social Protest Cycles: A Sociomaterial Examination. Information Systems Research 32(3):1066-1090. <a href="https://doi-org.remote.baruch.cuny.edu/10.1287/isre.2021.1013">https://doi-org.remote.baruch.cuny.edu/10.1287/isre.2021.1013</a> [Setareh]</li> </ol> <p><b>Optional:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Sarkar, S., Vance, A. Ramesh, B., Demestihias, M., Wu, D. 2020. "The Influence of Professional Subculture on Information Security Policy Violations: A Field Study in a Healthcare Context." Information Systems Research, 31 (4), pp. 1240–1259</li> <li>2. Gasson, S., &amp; Waters, J. (2013). Using a grounded theory approach to study online collaboration behaviors. European Journal of Information Systems, 22(1), 95-118.</li> </ol>
Apr 10 <sup>th</sup>	Spring Recess	
10. Apr 17 <sup>th</sup>	Process theorizing	<p><b>Guest speaker: Alain Claude Tambe Ebot, Assistant Professor, Baruch College</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Strategies for Theorizing from Process Data, Ann Langley, The Academy of Management Review, Vol. 24, No. 4 (Oct., 1999), pp. 691-710 (20 pages), <a href="https://www.jstor.org/stable/259349">https://www.jstor.org/stable/259349</a> <a href="https://doi.org/10.2307/259349">https://doi.org/10.2307/259349</a></li> <li>2. Andrew H. van de Ven; Marshall Scott Poole, “Explaining Development and Change in Organizations”, The Academy of Management review, 1995, 20 (3), p.510-540</li> </ol>

		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Knut H. Rolland, Lars Mathiassen, Arun Rai (2018) Managing Digital Platforms in User Organizations: The Interactions Between Digital Options and Digital Debt. <i>Information Systems Research</i> 29(2):419-443. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1287/isre.2018.0788">https://doi.org/10.1287/isre.2018.0788</a> [Setareh]</li> <li>4. Mari Karjalainen, Suprateek Sarker, Mikko Siponen (2019) Toward a Theory of Information Systems Security Behaviors of Organizational Employees: A Dialectical Process Perspective. <i>Information Systems Research</i> 30(2):687-704. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1287/isre.2018.0827">https://doi.org/10.1287/isre.2018.0827</a> [Fan]</li> <li>5. Daniel Fürstenau, Abayomi Baiyere, Natalia Kliewer (2019) A Dynamic Model of Embeddedness in Digital Infrastructures. <i>Information Systems Research</i> 30(4):1319-1342. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1287/isre.2019.0864">https://doi.org/10.1287/isre.2019.0864</a> [Yiming]</li> <li>6. Lehmann, Julian; Recker, Jan; Yoo, Youngjin; and Rosenkranz, Christoph. 2022. "Designing Digital Market Offerings: How Digital Ventures Navigate the Tension Between Generative Digital Technology and the Current Environment," <i>MIS Quarterly</i>, (46: 3) pp.1453-1482. [Zhaoyi]</li> </ol>
<b>Module IV: Qualitative Data Analysis</b>		
11. Apr 24 <sup>th</sup>	Coding Qualitative Data	<p>Guest speaker: <b>Isaac Vaghefi, Assistant Professor, Baruch College and Lisa Santa Coloma, Doctoral Student, Baruch College</b></p> <p>Below is a tentative reading list</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Mason, Ch. 8</li> <li>2. Ryan, Gery W., and H. Russell Bernard. "Techniques to identify themes." <i>Field methods</i> 15, no. 1 (2003): 85-109.</li> <li>3. Locke, Karen, Martha Feldman, and Karen Golden-Biddle. "Coding practices and iterativity: Beyond templates for analyzing qualitative data." <i>Organizational Research Methods</i> 25, no. 2 (2022): 262-284.</li> <li>4. Langley, Ann, and Chahrazad Abdallah. "Templates and turns in qualitative studies of strategy and management." In <i>Building methodological bridges</i>, vol. 6, pp. 201-235. Emerald Group Publishing Limited, 2011.</li> <li>5. Kossek, Ellen Ernst, Tracy L. Dumas, Matthew M. Piszczek, and Tammy D. Allen. "Pushing the boundaries: A qualitative study of how stem women adapted to disrupted work–nonwork boundaries during the COVID-19 pandemic." <i>Journal of Applied Psychology</i> 106, no. 11 (2021) [Zhaoyi and Setareh]</li> <li>6. Isaac Vaghefi, Bogdan Negoita, Liette Lapointe (2022) The Path to Hedonic Information System Use Addiction: A Process Model in the Context of Social Networking Sites. <i>Information Systems Research</i> 34(1):85-110. [Fan and Yiming]</li> </ol>
12. May 1 <sup>st</sup>	Within-Case and Cross-case analysis	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Miles and Huberman, Chs. 5 and 8.</b></li> <li>2. Bechky B. A., O’Mahony S. 2016 “Leveraging comparative field data for theory generation.” In <i>Elsbach K. D., Kramer R. M. (eds.), Handbook of Qualitative Organizational Research: Innovative Pathways and Methods: 168–176</i>. New York: Routledge. [Zhaoyi and Fan]</li> <li>3. Orlikowski, Wanda J., "Improvising Organizational Transformation Over Time: A Situated Change Perspective," <i>Information Systems Research</i>, 7 (1), 1996, 63-92. [Setareh]</li> </ol>

		<p>4. Bechky, B. A., &amp; Chung, D. E. (2018). Latitude or Latent Control? How Occupational Embeddedness and Control Shape Emergent Coordination. <i>Administrative Science Quarterly</i>, 63(3), 607–636. <a href="https://doi-org.remote.baruch.cuny.edu/10.1177/0001839217726545">https://doi-org.remote.baruch.cuny.edu/10.1177/0001839217726545</a> [Yiming]</p>
<b>Module V: Writing, Publishing, and Reviewing Qualitative Research</b>		
13. May 8 <sup>th</sup>	Composing a qualitative paper	<p>1. Myers Ch. 17/18</p> <p>2. Kevin G. Corley and Dennis A. Gioia, “Building Theory about Theory Building: What Constitutes a Theoretical Contribution?” <i>Academy of Management Review</i>, 36 (1), pg. 12-32</p> <p>3. Gehman, J., Glaser, V. L., Eisenhardt, K. M., Gioia, D., Langley, A., &amp; Corley, K. G. (2018). Finding Theory–Method Fit: A Comparison of Three Qualitative Approaches to Theory Building. <i>Journal of Management Inquiry</i>, 27(3), 284–300. <a href="https://doi-org.remote.baruch.cuny.edu/10.1177/1056492617706029">https://doi-org.remote.baruch.cuny.edu/10.1177/1056492617706029</a></p> <p>4. Pratt, M. G., Kaplan, S., &amp; Whittington, R. (2020). Editorial Essay: The Tumult over Transparency: Decoupling Transparency from Replication in Establishing Trustworthy Qualitative Research. <i>Administrative Science Quarterly</i>, 65(1), 1–19. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1177/0001839219887663">https://doi.org/10.1177/0001839219887663</a></p> <p>5. Cloutier, C., &amp; Ravasi, D. (2021). Using tables to enhance trustworthiness in qualitative research. <i>Strategic Organization</i>, 19(1), 113–133. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1177/1476127020979329">https://doi.org/10.1177/1476127020979329</a></p> <p><b>Optional</b></p> <p>6. Jennifer Howard-Grenville, Andrew Nelson, Heather Vough, and Tammar B. Zilber, 2021: From the Editors—Achieving Fit and Avoiding Misfit in Qualitative Research. <i>AMJ</i>, 64, 1313–1323, <a href="https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2021.4005">https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2021.4005</a> [Fantastic reference for all inclusive bibliography on qualitative research issues]</p> <p>7. John W. Creswell and Dana L. Miller (2000) Determining Validity in <i>Qualitative Inquiry, Theory Into Practice</i>, 39:3, 124-130</p> <p>8. Barrett M., Walsham G. (2004) Making Contributions From Interpretive Case Studies: Examining Processes of Construction and Use. In: Kaplan B., Truex D.P., Wastell D., Wood-Harper A.T., DeGross J.I. (eds) <i>Information Systems Research</i>. IFIP International Federation for Information Processing, vol 143. Springer, Boston, MA. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1007/1-4020-8095-6_17">https://doi.org/10.1007/1-4020-8095-6_17</a></p>
14. May 15 <sup>th</sup>	Reviewing a qualitative paper	<p>1. Pratt, Michael G., “For the Lack of a Boilerplate: Tips on Writing up (And Reviewing) Qualitative Research,” <i>Academy of Management Journal</i>, 52 (5), 856-862.</p> <p>2. Lee, Allen S. "Reviewing a Manuscript for Publication," <i>Journal of Operations Management</i>, 13 (1), 1995, 87-92. <a href="http://www.people.vcu.edu/~aslee/referee.htm">http://www.people.vcu.edu/~aslee/referee.htm</a></p> <p>3. Editor’s Comments: “From the Trenches: Thoughts on Developmental Reviewing” <i>MIS Quarterly</i>, 29 (2), 2005, iii-xii.</p>
15. May 22 <sup>nd</sup>	Student presentations	Revised paper due



## 7 Lynda King Case Description<sup>2</sup>

Lynda King's graduation ceremony at Georgia State University was something she would always remember. Although her family kidded her about finally getting out of school at age 33, the smiles on their faces on that warm May afternoon in 2004 revealed their pride in her accomplishments. Lynda's advisor, John Applegate, was also proud of Lynda. As he said his final goodbyes, he reminded her about the work that lay ahead. "Lynda, don't neglect that paper from your dissertation that we discussed. It's going to take more time than you think, and you won't have much time when you start teaching at NYU in the fall. So get working on it right away."

Lynda's dissertation was a qualitative analysis of clerical workers' responses to the introduction of new technologies in the workplace. She chose the topic because it resonated with her own frustrations as a consultant in the two years before she began her doctoral studies. Lynda chose qualitative analysis because it allowed her to get at more of the feelings that people held toward technologies. In contrast to the prevailing use of quantitative measures of worker attitudes, intentions, and perceptions, Lynda's study focused on interviews and observations of workers as they interacted with new technologies. She learned that many workers were disenchanted with managerial efforts to make them keep pace with new technologies. Lynda's study offered a critical, feminist perspective on the management of technology.

Lynda and her husband moved into their New York apartment on June 1, three weeks after the graduation ceremony. May had been consumed by packing and moving, and the new apartment needed lots of furnishings right away. Lynda's husband began his medical residency two days later, so Lynda was stuck with the job of fixing up their apartment. "It's great that you have the summer off to get us settled," he had said.

Soon after moving in, Lynda paid a visit to her new department to get oriented. She was given an old syllabus for the course that she had been hired to "update radically." She was also given a copy of the recently approved "target journal list" for faculty publications. Lynda's heart skipped a beat when she realized that her favorite journal, to which she expected to submit her research paper, was not on the list.

Lynda was pleased to have finished a qualitative study that satisfied her committee at GSU. At her final oral defense, the committee members praised her work for its lucid insights into the working conditions of ordinary people using advanced technologies. Now, could she satisfy the editors and referees who would read her manuscript after it was submitted for review? Would the editors even send it out for review? Would her work be seen as politically incorrect because it critiqued management practice from a feminist perspective? These worries made it difficult for her to sit down and begin writing the article version of her dissertation.

Lynda's task was complicated by the fact that her dissertation was 314 pages long, and most journals limited submitted papers to 40 pages. How could she condense this huge volume of work into a single article?

Lynda also worried about the reception of her work by her new colleagues at New York University. As a native New Yorker, Lynda was thrilled to receive an offer from a top school in her hometown. The move also allowed her husband to get a residency at one of the many New York hospitals. But NYU had high standards for tenure. "Five or six A pubs is usually enough for tenure," she had been told during her interviews. Five or six! As a qualitative researcher, Lynda wondered how she could possibly conduct enough studies to produce articles at that pace. After 13 months of fieldwork and 8 months of analysis and writing, she had produced one study. Where would the other 4 or 5 articles needed for tenure come

---

<sup>2</sup> Case is used as-is from Prof. Daniel Robey's BA9300 seminar on Qualitative Research Methods in Business at Georgia State University.

from?

In addition to her fear about the number of articles that she had to publish, Lynda also worried that her new colleagues would not see her work as rigorous. Most of the faculty members in her department at NYU were doing quantitative research using structural equation modeling (SEM) on large samples. She was open to working on quantitative studies with her new colleagues, and her doctoral training had included several courses in quantitative research methods, including SEM. But she doubted that she would be seen as strong enough to contribute to advanced research using those techniques.

In mid-June, Lynda checked her diary. She was scheduled for new faculty orientation on August 15. She had pulled together most of the material for the course she would teach, but she wanted to search for updated cases to replace some of the older cases. Her apartment was in disarray, despite her efforts to find new furniture at affordable prices in the city. Her parents were coming to stay for a week to help out with the apartment. And that “major paper” from her dissertation had received three false starts.

### 7.1 Questions to Develop Your Week 1 Memo:

1. Based on your other readings of this week and the case, do you think that qualitative research is less valuable than quantitative research? Why or why not? When is qualitative research appropriate? [± 300 words]
2. Based on your other readings of this week and the case, identify and briefly explain at least three typical concerns associated with qualitative research as far as non-qualitative researchers are concerned? [± 300 words]
3. What should Lynda do during the remainder of the summer? What research goals should she have for the coming year? How could she meet criteria for publishing additional 4/5 articles? What would you do if you are in her place? [± 300 words]
4. Think about the past research proposals you have written for other courses. Pick your favorite proposal. For this proposal, answer following questions about the research proposed (Mason Chapter 1): [one-page or 1 PPT slide per one question below]
  - a. Your ontological perspective,
  - b. Your epistemological perspective,
  - c. Your broad research area,
  - d. Your intellectual puzzle,
  - e. Your research question, and
  - f. Your aims and purpose
5. How would your research question posed in the previous proposals change if you were to follow qualitative research? (JAIS Commentaries Part I/II, Myers Chap 2/3) [one-page or 1 PPT slide per one question below]
  - a. What “reasoning” approach would you want to use?
  - b. Would your ontological and epistemological perspectives change or remain the same? Explain.
  - c. What possible qualitative method or genre would you use in this re-imagined research?
  - d. What would constitute as the qualitative data in this re-imagined research?