UC Riverside
Issues in Applied Linguistics

Title
Designing Qualitative Research by Catherine Marshall an Gretchen B. Rossman

Permalink
https://escholarship.org/uc/item/3m25g8j8

Journal
Issues in Applied Linguistics, 1(2)

ISSN
1050-4273

Author
Lynch, Brian K

Publication Date
1990-12-30

DOI
10.5070/L412004995

Peer reviewed

eScholarship.org Powered by the California Digital Library
University of California

All in all, *Design for Cross-Cultural Learning* is an interesting book which should prove useful to administrators and designers of both study abroad programs for American students and orientation programs for immigrants and foreign students in this country. But the book should not, I feel, be used as the authoritative manual its authors evidently intend it to be. Rather, it can serve as a source of ideas for improving the cultural learning component of already existing international and intercultural education programs. Language teachers wishing to incorporate "culture" into their language courses would be better advised to consult resources that address their needs more directly (e.g., Damen, 1987; Valdes, 1986).

References

Damen, L. (1987). *Culture learning: The fifth dimension in the language classroom.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Hall, E.T. (1976). *Beyond culture.* Garden City, NY: Anchor/Doubleday.

Landis, D. & Brislin, R.W. (Eds.). (1983). *Handbook of intercultural training* (Vols. 1-3). New York: Pergamon.

Seelye, H.N. (1984). *Teaching culture: Strategies for intercultural communication.* Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.

Valdes, J.M. (Ed.). (1986). *Culture bound: Bridging the cultural gap in language teaching.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Perias Sithambaram, a Ph.D. student in international education at the University of Southern California, has lived and studied in four countries. His academic interests include second-language acquisition, literacy, and language planning.

Designing Qualitative Research by Catherine Marshall and Gretchen B. Rossman. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, 1989. 175 pp.

Reviewed by
Brian K. Lynch
University of California, Los Angeles

One of the more important issues cutting across the various subdisciplines of applied linguistics is the choice of research

paradigm. This choice has been discussed, primarily in the literature of education, sociology and psychology, in terms of quantitative research versus qualitative research. Each paradigm seems to be associated with specific research methods, but, more importantly, each is associated with a particular epistemological tradition. Quantitative research stems from positivism, which takes an objectivist perspective: reality is seen as independent of the mind, an external, objective entity waiting to be discovered through the use of rigorously controlled experimental design and appropriate statistical techniques. Qualitative research has its origins in interpretivism, which takes a relativist perspective: reality is seen as mind-dependent, with no externally existing foundation against which to measure or validate our knowledge claims.

Some researchers argue that the debate between the paradigms is no longer necessary or productive (Reichardt & Cook, 1979; Howe, 1988), while others claim the two perspectives are fundamentally incompatible (Smith & Heshusius, 1986; Smith, 1988). In applied linguistics literature, the issue of quantitative versus qualitative methods has occasionally been addressed, sometimes indirectly, by arguing for process evaluations (Long, 1984) or classroom centered research (Long, 1983); at other times more directly, by using a combination of quantitative and qualitative methods (Beretta, 1986; Brown, 1989; Lynch, 1990). Nevertheless, in all of these cases, the possibility of the epistemological incompatibility of the two paradigms has not been addressed. In contrast, van Lier (1988) has argued that the important issue is not which methods to use--qualitative, quantitative, or both--but the need to be open to "different ways of arriving at understanding" (van Lier, 1988, p. 12), which is essentially an argument for the compatibility of the research paradigms.

Applied linguists who are at least opening up to the idea that qualitative research may offer some important insights to our inquiries will find Catherine Marshall and Gretchen Rossman's *Designing Qualitative Research* a useful book. Written as a "guide through the process of writing a qualitative research proposal" (p. 11), this book is organized around the sections of a traditional research proposal. The authors illustrate their points with "vignettes" from actual (occasionally fictitious) research proposed and conducted by the authors and other social scientists. Rather than offer a complete elaboration of qualitative research methodology, the authors state that their goal is "to give practical,

useful guidance for writing proposals that fit within the qualitative paradigm and that are successful" (p. 12). They acknowledge that in order to be successful with funding agencies and dissertation committees, qualitative research must be made acceptable to persons operating within a predominantly positivist, quantitative perspective. This concern with justifying qualitative research permeates the book and, at times, gives it a rather apologetic, defensive tone. Indeed, the final chapter is titled "Defending the Value and Logic of Qualitative Research." However, for people coming to this book from an applied linguistics backgound, this defensive stance is probably a realistic strategy to adopt given the dominance of the positivist perspective in our field.

The opening chapter of *Designing Qualitative Research* outlines the wide range of research traditions that fall within the qualitative paradigm, from ethnography to ecological psychology. Marshall & Rossman then point out the central difficulty in writing a qualitative research proposal: the need to present a clearly focused design for research that is inherently "messy," with its focus emerging from the act of carrying out the research. Their solution to this problem is to recommend that in support of the proposed research the qualitative researcher build a logical argument which demonstrates a focus by linking the specific research context to a larger body of theoretical issues and policy concerns.

Chapters 2 and 3 discuss the sections of the traditional research proposal: introduction, significance of the research, review of related literature, and research design and methods. While recognizing that a qualitative research proposal could take many different forms, the authors suggest adhering to the traditional outline "because it eases acceptance of qualitative studies and demonstrates their relationship to other approaches" (p. 43).

Chapter 2 discusses the building of a study's conceptual framework which includes the general research topic, the significance of the research, and the review of related literature. This framework is designed to give the proposal's audience a clear sense of what the study is about--what questions it seeks to answer, who will care about it and why, and how it relates to a larger body of issues and concerns. The authors also suggest including a section which states the research focus more precisely and offers "guiding hypotheses." The guiding hypotheses are proposed as "useful in communicating with more positivist researchers" (p. 44), but are presented as tentative and capable of being discarded or replaced as the research is conducted.

A majority of the pages in this book are devoted to Chapter 3 which presents a fairly detailed description of the proposal's design and methodology section. Just as with the statement of the research problem, there is a need to keep the research design flexible since qualitative research needs to have its design emerge, or evolve, as it is being conducted. The problem is similar to the dilemma of giving a sense of clear focus to the study while letting the focus emerge as the research unfolds: how do you keep the emergent character of qualitative research while at the same time having to convince the proposal audience that you know what you are doing? Marshall & Rossman suggest that the researcher clearly articulate the logic and appropriateness of the qualitative approach for the proposed research in the methodology section and include aspects of traditional, quantitative designs, while making it clear that the design may need to be modified during the course of data collection.

The bulk of the chapter delineates the methodological issues that must be addressed in the presentation of the actual research design: site and sample selection, researcher's role management, research strategies, data collection techniques, managing and recording data, data analysis strategies, and the management plan and feasibility analysis. In addition to defining each of these, the authors offer examples of how they are executed in qualitative research. Again, the vignettes play an important role, as they excellently exemplify the problems involved in gaining entry to the research setting and in dealing with ethical questions raised in ethnographic research.

Chapter 4 provides a useful discussion of projecting the time and resources needed for a qualitative study. The authors point out that it is this aspect of the proposal which demonstrates the competence of the researcher:

> Careful, detailed consideration of the resource demands of a study is critical in demonstrating that the researcher is knowledgeable about qualitative research, understands that the inherent flexibility will create resource difficulties at some point in the study, but has thought through the resource issues and recognizes the demands that will be made (p. 121).

Part of this chapter offers a vignette example which demonstrates how to indicate clearly the link between requested resources and research results.

Chapter 5 returns to the idea of providing a logical argument to support the use of qualitative research. Following the work of

Lincoln & Guba (1985), the authors suggest that qualitative research be judged against "criteria of soundness": the *credibility* of the study, its *transferability* to other contexts, its *dependability*, and its *confirmability*. These criteria essentially define the notions of reliability and validity from the qualitative perspective. The inappropriateness of the quantitative conceptualization of reliability and validity for qualitative research is also discussed. In particular, the traditional quantitative concern for reliability in the sense of *replicability* is seen as inappropriate for qualitative research inasmuch as the static, unchanging reality of the research setting assumed in the quantitative paradigm (with its associated "controls" over extraneous variables) is impossible in the qualitative context. Marshall & Rossman do, however, offer suggestions for addressing the concerns of replicability from a qualitative view, and they present methods for controlling researcher bias in qualitative studies.

It is hard not to want more than how to write a proposal from a book titled *Designing Qualitative Research,* although in certain sections, Marshall & Rossman do go beyond mere proposal writing, especially in the discussion of qualitative data collection techniques in Chapter 3. The detail they offer concerning specific techniques is uneven--observation is only discussed in terms of Patton's (1980) framework for the various roles an observer can play. Yet, one comes away with a useful introduction to the range of qualitative data collection activities. Similarly, while the authors note that data analysis strategies cannot be discussed in detail within the context of the research proposal, they do offer a reasonable summary of the most commonly used analytic techniques.

There are a few places where the discussion of data collection could benefit from some elaboration. For example, when discussing the interview technique (pp. 82-83), Marshall & Rossman seem to imply that observations are description while interviews are "fact". Yet it is interviews which are more likely to be affected by researcher bias. Why observations are less prone to researcher bias than interviews is not exactly made clear. A more productive way of presenting the use of both observation and interview would be as two different types of data sources, both of which can be used as a check on the other, both of which can fall prey to researcher bias.

Another area in need of elaboration is the presentation of Lincoln & Guba's (1985) constructs for addressing the issues of reliability and validity, in particular, the construct of *confirmability*. The authors claim that confirmability captures the traditional concept

of objectivity--a dangerous statement given that most qualitative researchers eschew objectivism. However, without an explanation of how "the findings of the study could be confirmed by another" (p. 147), this construct remains somewhat vague.

A final concern is the authors' many references to *generalizability* throughout the text (e.g., p. 56, p. 97). Generalizability is usually not a concern of qualitative researchers. Guba (1978) in fact questions the desirability, if not the possibility, of establishing generalizations, while Cronbach (1975) sees a generalization as nothing more than "a working hypothesis, not a conclusion" (p. 125). It may be that Marshall & Rossman's overt concern for making qualitative research palatable to persons from the quantitative perspective leads them out of the qualitative paradigm at times. The danger, as Smith & Heshusius (1986) point out, is in turning qualitative research into a methodological variant of quantitative research, but the authors do seem to recognize this danger when discussing Miles & Huberman's (1984) work (p. 115).

Despite these minor criticisms, *Designing Qualitative Research* has a great deal to offer. It clearly shows the integrative, multi-disciplinary nature of the literature pertaining to qualitative research and the resulting expansion of available research techniques. Given the cross-disciplinary nature of our field, this quality should be very attractive to applied linguists. The authors also make explicit the types of research contexts best served by the qualitative approach (e.g., p. 46) and, through their vignettes, provide the reader with clear and convincing arguments to support the use of qualitative research to answer a variety of questions. Certain vignettes are particularly illuminating, such as one describing the negotiation of entry into the research setting (a liquor store/bar in the inner city, p. 64) and one dealing with the ethical dilemmas faced by a researcher studying the subculture of drug addicts (pp. 72-73).

Marshall & Rossman also do an excellent job of bringing in the relevant literature on methodological techniques. Their discussion of reliability and validity, despite the concern for generalizability, points out the important distinctions between the qualitative and quantitative perspectives. In particular, they make the important point that qualitative research does not aspire to replicability, and they suggest ways in which qualitative researchers "can respond" to the concern that nonreplicable studies are unreliable--primarily by making the data and procedures accessible

and retrievable by others. Furthermore, they quite accurately point out that any inquiry, qualitative or quantitative, has its interpretive side: "It is a process of bringing meaning to raw, inexpressive data that is necessary whether the researcher's language is ANOVAs and means or rich description of ordinary events" (p. 114).

Designing Qualitative Research is an excellent book for applied linguists who have been working primarily in the quantitative paradigm and feel the need for a more descriptive approach to their inquiry. It does a fine job of providing qualitative research with a rationale that most quantitative researchers should be able to accept. While at times this is done at the expense of sounding overly apologetic and defensive, in the end an uncompromised picture of qualitative research is presented. The epistemological issues not as thoroughly addressed in applied linguistics literature are also given a certain amount of attention. Used with other sources, Marshall & Rossman's text would be valuable in an introduction to research design course, as a reference for writing a thesis or dissertation proposal, or as an inspiration for doing one's own research within the qualitative paradigm.

REFERENCES

Beretta, A. (1986). Toward a methodology of ESL program evaluation. *TESOL Quarterly, 20*, 144-155.

Brown, J.D. (1989). Language program evaluation: A synthesis of existing possibilities. In R.K. Johnson (Ed.), *The second language curriculum* (pp. 222-242). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cronbach, L.J. (1975). Beyond the two disciplines of scientific psychology. *American Psychologist, 30,* 116-127.

Guba, E.G. (1978). *Toward a methodology of naturalistic inquiry in educational evaluation*. CSE Monograph Series in Evaluation, No. 8. Los Angeles: Center for the Study of Evaluation, UCLA Graduate School of Education, University of California, Los Angeles.

Howe, K.R. (1988). Against the quantitative-qualitative incompatibility thesis: Or dogmas die hard. *Educational Researcher, 17*(8),10-16.

Lincoln, Y. & Guba, E. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Newbury Park: Sage.

Long, M.H. (1983). Inside the black box: Methodological issues in classroom research on language learning. In H.W. Seliger & M.H. Long (Eds.), *Classroom oriented research in second language acquisition* (pp. 3-35). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Long, M.H. (1984). Process and product in ESL program evaluation. *TESOL Quarterly, 18*, 409-425.

Lynch, B.K. (1990). A context-adaptive model for program evaluation. *TESOL Quarterly, 24*, 23-42.

Miles, M.B. & Huberman, A.M. (1984). *Qualitative data analysis: A sourcebook of new methods*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Patton, M.Q. (1980). *Qualitative evaluation methods*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Reichardt, C.S. & Cook, T.D. (1979.) Beyond qualitative versus quantitative methods. In T.D. Cook & C.S. Reichardt (Eds.), *Qualitative and quantitative methods in evaluation research* (pp. 7-33). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Smith, J.K. & L. Heshusius. (1986). Closing down the conversation: The end of the quantitative-qualitative debate among educational inquirers. *Educational Researcher, 15*(1), 4-12.

Smith, J.K. (1988). The evaluator/researcher as person vs. the person as evaluator/researcher. *Educational Researcher, 17*(2), 18-23.

van Lier, L. (1988). *The classroom and the language learner*. London: Longman.

Brian Lynch is an Adjunct Assistant Professor in the Department of TESL & Applied Linguistics at the University of California, Los Angeles, where he also serves as Academic Director of the ESL Service Courses. His primary research interests are program evaluation, language testing, and English for Specific Purposes.

Guidelines: A Cross-Cultural Reading/Writing Text. Ruth Spack. New York: St. Martin's, 1990. vii-338 pp.

Reviewed by
Christine Holten and Carol Ann Linn
University of California, Los Angeles

Recent research in the fields of first and second language composition has increased our understanding of the kind of activity writing is. Hayes & Flower (1980, 1987), for example, using think-aloud protocol analysis of both skilled and unskilled writers at work, have found that first-language composing is a recursive, goal-oriented activity consisting of three major processes: planning, sentence generation, and revising, all of which occur in free variation throughout the production of a written text. Similarly, investigations of the composing behaviors of L2 writers (Jones & Tetroe, 1984; Raimes, 1987; Cumming, 1988) have paid particular attention to the interaction between writing skill and second language proficiency. While neither the relative weight of linguistic factors and writing ability nor their interaction with other variables (e.g., language background, length of residence in the L2 environment, age, and education) has been precisely determined,