

Good Work Project Report Series, Number 3

The Empirical Basis of Good Work: Methodological Considerations

Howard Gardner, Anne Gregory, Mihaly
Csikszentmihalyi, William Damon, and
Mimi Michaelson

June, 1997

Updated February, 2001

Jeff Solomon, Series Editor
Project Zero
Harvard University

COPYRIGHT 2001. All Rights Reserved.

The Good Work Project February 2001

Since 1995, three teams of investigators, under the direction of Howard Gardner, of Harvard University, Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi of Claremont Graduate University, and William Damon of Stanford University, have been researching the ways in which leading professionals in a variety of domains carry out good work. "Good work" is used in a dual sense: 1) work that is deemed to be of high quality and 2) work that is socially responsible. Through intensive, face-to-face interviews, the researchers have investigated several domains, including journalism, genetics, business, jazz music, theater, philanthropy, and higher education. Pilot studies have been conducted of medicine and the rapidly emerging domain of "cyberlaw", with plans to explore these areas more fully in the future.

In addition to this central line of study, several other related lines of investigation have been launched:

1. The Origins of Good Work project is an examination of teenagers who excel in extracurricular activities.
2. The Dedicated Young Professionals Study focuses on those who have just begun (or will soon begin) promising professional careers.
3. Good Work in Interdisciplinary Contexts. Pilot studies of new arts/science media and of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology's Media Lab have been completed. Plans are underway to study interdisciplinary work at the pre-collegiate, college, and research institution level.
4. The Role of Contemplative Practices investigates the ways in which contemplation/meditation influence how professionals carry out work.
5. Encouraging Good Work in Journalism. This project, carried out in conjunction with the Committee of Concerned Journalists, is currently developing a "traveling curriculum" for use in newsrooms around the country.
6. Good Work as Transmitted through Lineages examines how the principle of doing good work is passed down through continuous generations of teachers to students or from mentors to less experienced professionals.
7. Good Work in Other Societies is a project spearheaded by colleagues at Denmark's Royal Danish School of Education that investigates good work in Denmark and Latvia. In the future, additional international components will be added.

The Project expects to issue a variety of books, reports, and related documentation. The present series, launched in early 2001, includes reports on several of the lines of research mentioned above. For further information on the Good Work Project, contact Professor Howard Gardner's office at 617-496-4929, via email at hgasst@harvard.edu, or through regular mail at 201 Larsen Hall, Harvard Graduate School of Education, Cambridge, MA, 02138.

Papers On Good Work
February 2001

1. The Project on Good Work: A Description (April, 2000), Howard Gardner, Mihaly Csikzentmihalyi, and William Damon.
2. The Ethical Responsibilities of Professionals (July, 1998), Howard Gardner
3. The Empirical Basis of Good Work: Methodological Considerations (June, 1997), Howard Gardner, Anne Gregory, Mihalyi Csikzentmihalyi, William Damon, and Mimi Michaelson.
4. Good Work in Business (August, 2000), Kim Barberich and Howard Gardner.
5. Good Work Among Dedicated Young Professionals (July, 2000), Becca Solomon, Greg Feldman, and Marcy LeLacheur.
6. Contemplation and Implications for Good Work in Teaching (August, 1998), Laurinda Morway, Jeff Solomon, Mimi Michaelson, and Howard Gardner.
7. Good Work in a Complex World: A Cross Cultural Comparison (November, 1998), Hans Henrik Knoop and Howard Gardner.
8. Opportunities and Obstacles for Good Work in Medicine (August, 2000), Jeff Solomon, Jennifer DiBara, Sara Simeone, and Dan Dillon.
9. New Media Art: A New Frontier or Continued Tradition? (January, 2001), Kaley Middlebrooks.
10. The Origins of Good Work (April, 2000), Wendy Fischman and Grace Lam.
11. Good Work among Albert Schweitzer Fellows (April, 1999), Wendy Fischman, Becca Solomon, and Deborah Shutte.
12. High Abilities and Excellence: A Cultural Perspective (2000), Jin Li
13. Interdisciplinary Research and Education: Preliminary Perspectives from the MIT Media Laboratory (January, 2001), Dan Dillon.
14. Good Work in Cyberlaw (August, 2000), Evan Zullo.
15. Getting Kids, Parents, and Coaches on the Same Page (2000), Becca Solomon and Howard Gardner.

Acknowledgement

The Good Work Project is made possible by the generous support of:

The Bauman Foundation

The Carnegie Corporation

The Nathan Cummings Foundation

The J. Epstein Foundation

Fetzer Institute

The Ford Foundation

The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation

The Christian A. Johnson Endeavor Foundation

Thomas E. Lee

The Jesse Phillips Foundation Fund

Louise and Claude Rosenberg Jr. Family Foundation

Ross Family Charitable Foundation

The Spencer Foundation

The John Templeton Foundation

I. Introduction

In 1995, researchers from Brown University, Harvard University, and the University of Chicago¹ began a large scale study of good work. The project focuses on how individuals produce high quality and responsible work during times of rapid change.

Our goal in this study has been to investigate the pressures and opportunities that affect individuals who are carrying out “cutting edge” work in several disciplines and domains. We seek to understand what it is like to be a journalist, biological scientist, actor, medical doctor, or lawyer in the trenches today, to capture the experiences of these professionals as they have described them to us in far-ranging interviews.

However, our study seeks to go beyond the descriptive. We are particularly interested in those individuals and institutions that succeed in maintaining a sense of purpose and balance in the face of intense and often conflicting pressures. As our term ‘good work’ suggests, we are interested in work that is “good” in two ways: work that is of high quality and work that is socially responsible.

The interviewees in our study suggest to us ways in which they (or others like them) devise and use strategies to prevent or overcome obstacles. Many of these strategies may seem responsible as well as creative. From this evidence, without making judgments about individual interviewees, we can construct prototypes of individuals and institutions that succeed in being responsible to their own goals and purposes, to

¹ Several members of the project are now at different locations: William Damon is at Stanford University (he was at Brown University), Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi moved from The University of Chicago to Claremont College, and Anne Gregory, is at The University of California, at Berkeley (she was at Brown).

the concerns of those around them, to the wider world and/or to the calling or profession that they have chosen.

The ultimate goal of our study is to bring the phenomenon of Good Work to the attention of a wide public and to find ways in which to encourage its flourishing in individuals all over the world. Accordingly, in the latter years of the study, we will work intensively with those who are charged with the training of young professionals. Our belief is that, with proper training and role models, many more individuals will be challenged to combine the excitement of creativity with the mandate to act in responsible and constructive ways.

II. The scope of the project

At the center of the investigation is our *core study*—semi-structured interviews averaging two hours in length with topflight professionals in several domains. By the end of 1999 we had completed interviews with approximately 90 journalists and 60 researchers and clinicians in the area of genetics. We have also launched comparable investigations in several additional domains; including business, theater, philanthropy, and higher education, as well as pilot studies in medicine and law. Thus far, we have interviewed over five hundred subjects across different domains and associated projects. The following are affiliated projects concerning good work:

A. The Origins of Good Work. We are investigating analogous issues of high quality and responsible work with gifted young practitioners in several domains of

talent, including music, theater, figure skating, and gymnastics. We have also interviewed young children who are active in social service work as well as young people who excel in the social service dimension. To date, approximately 150 young people have been interviewed in these combined studies.

B. Good Work in Young Professionals. We are investigating the relationship between innovation and responsibility in beginning professionals in journalism, biology, theater, and business. We are also studying individuals who, in the course of medical training, devote time to community service. We have interviewed a total of approximately 75 young professionals.

C. Good Work and the Contemplative Mind. To complement our study of the way in which leading professionals deal with external pressures and changes in their domain, we are also examining the role of reflection and other contemplative practices reported by practitioners. We believe that such a study will illuminate how professionals deal with stress and find equilibrium in their hectic lives. Thus far we have interviewed 80 subjects in this ongoing study, including journalists, scientists, and jazz musicians.

D. Apprenticeships in Good Work. We are interested in the ways in which, crucial beliefs and practices are passed on from mentor to student, and henceforth transmitted to succeeding generations. Accordingly, we have undertaken a study of

well-regarded lineages, in which we interview individuals drawn from several generations in journalism, biology and business. Thus far we have interviewed about 80 professionals as part of this lineage study. We have also begun to study mentoring lineages in some athletic domains, including modern dance, coaching, and martial arts.

E. Good Work Abroad. In Denmark and Latvia, our colleague, Hans Henrik Knoop, has been exploring good work in Higher Education. Ultimately we hope to collaborate with teams of colleagues in many regions around the world.

Each of these ancillary investigations has its own issues and methodology. However, we have developed a general approach to the empirical investigation of good work and that approach is our focus here. Insofar as possible, the various studies have been designed in consort, so that comparisons can be made between, for example, gifted young practitioners and adult creators.

In addition, whenever possible, we supplement our interviews with other sources of information. These include examining the works of the creators, reading secondary sources, talking about the work of our subjects with informants, following up the interviews with phone calls or correspondence. Most subjects consent to participate in a Q sort, where they are asked to rank order 30 values held by them and by other professionals (see Appendix A for an example of the Q sort).

III. Scope and Outline of This Paper

In this paper we focus on the analysis of our first domain, journalism. We lay out in considerable detail the steps we have taken to analyze our data and present the rationale for those steps. We do this for the record and also as a means of introducing colleagues and new researchers to the ways in which we study the phenomenon of good work. We use examples drawn from journalism in order to make our discussion concrete and as an example of the precise methods used at the outset of this study. In the ongoing broader study, we continue to use some of these methods and to develop others. For the most part, technical details are included as separate appendices. We expect to update this paper from time to time. Because the intent of this paper is in part pedagogical, we are especially grateful for any feedback.

The Study of the News Media (Journalists)

In 1997-8 we interviewed nearly 90 journalists: 60 as part of the core study, an additional 25 as part of the contemplation study. We attempted to balance the study in terms of gender, age, race, and ethnicity. Given the location of our research laboratories at that time, the bulk of our subjects came from the east coast and the middle west, but we surveyed other parts of the country as well.

An important distinction throughout our study concerns the role assumed by an individual within a profession. To select our sample, we relied significantly on the advice of *trustees*, senior individuals who are regarded by their colleagues as

individuals of unquestioned distinction and integrity, and who exhibit an abiding concern for the health of the domain. Our sample consists of three other groups of practitioners:

Creator/leaders (individuals of national distinction involved in cutting edge work); Gatekeepers (highly placed individuals whose primary role is to select or supervise creator/leaders); and Midlevel practitioners (individuals who have achieved some distinction but are not recognized as national or international leaders). (See Appendix B for detailed definitions of these types.)

Within the media, we elected to focus on journalists: individuals whose primary task is to describe events of current or, less often, historical significance. We did not survey individuals whose primary task is to provide entertainment or to create works of art. Our sample of journalists represents four groups: print, broadcast, internet, and documentary, with the majority of individuals coming from print or broadcast journalists (groups that currently predominate the profession.) (See Appendix C for a breakdown of our sample.)

1. The Interview

The interview covers nine major (main) topics (See Appendix D for entire interview used in the journalism study):

Opening (Goals and purposes)

Subjects are asked what they are trying to accomplish in their work; what gives meaning to their work; and to whom they feel responsible or loyal in their work.

Beliefs and Values

Subjects are asked about specific qualities and beliefs that lead to their achievements; the relationship between their beliefs and the dominant values in their domain; and how they might fare if they were working on their own or for another organization.

Work Process, on the Personal Level

Subjects are asked about which work they take pride in; the role of creativity in their work; the role of reflection in their work; which qualities inhibit their creativity; and the role of risk-taking in their work.

Positive and Negative Pressures at Work

Subjects are asked about the features that make it difficult to achieve goals; the kinds of work that are rewarded or discouraged; the roles of prestige and fame; which changes have taken place at the work place; whether they have time to reflect.

Formative Background

Subjects are asked about their childhood and adolescence; how they spent time as children; the role of familial and religious factors; the time that they first thought of themselves as professionals; the role of mentors and anti-mentors; influential readings, experiences, or projects in which they were involved.

Perspectives on Work

Subjects are asked about what they like and dislike about their place of work; whether they would do things differently if they had more authority; the anticipated future trajectory of their area of work; training the next generation.

Community and Family Relationships

Subjects are asked to identify their principal communities; how they balance private and family life; the role of religious or spiritual concerns.

Ethical Standards

Subjects are asked whether standards in their area of work are more or less ethical than in the past; about incidents at work when they were not sure about the right course of action; whether there are things that they would not do in their professional life, even though these contemplated acts are not illegal.

Closing

Subjects are asked if there is anything to add and whether the interviewer can follow up with them in the future.

We intend to survey the same nine areas for each domain of study. Specific questions will be geared to specifications of the domain in question, and we may add or delete certain questions as seems appropriate. For example, in the interviews in genetics, we added questions about ethical dilemmas of importance today, such as research on human cloning or conflicts of interest among the ends of making a profit, keeping information as proprietary, and sharing scientific knowledge as widely as possible.

Certain questions are included because of their relationship to other associated projects. Thus, issues about formative influences relate to the Origins study, questions about religion and spirituality to the Contemplation study, and questions about training and mentoring to the Apprenticeship-Lineage study.

By and large, interviewers pose questions in the way, and in the order, that they are worded in the interview protocol. However, the interview should proceed smoothly and comfortably for the subject, and interviewers have license to reword and reorder as warranted. When subjects give an unexpected answer, or when they seem to avoid a topic, interviewers are encouraged to follow up and, in a respectful manner, to challenge the subject. On occasion, the in-person interview may be followed by a telephone call or e-mail to clarify an obscure point or to secure a response on a question that was inadvertently omitted.

2. Overview of the Data Analysis

Put succinctly, the task of data analysis is to reduce transcripts, which run up to fifty single space pages, to categories, numbers, and ultimately empirical findings about contemporary domains—in the first instance, journalism. This has proved to be a challenging task. We begin by transcribing the audio tape and having it reviewed by the subject. The subject has the right to make changes and also to indicate material that is off the record. Subjects are not identified by name and other obviously identifying material is removed as far as possible. Subjects have the right to indicate how the material will be described in publications (i.e. identified by name; listed as part of a group; not identified at all).

Once the transcript has been prepared, it is converted into a *reading guide*. The reading guide is in essence a reordered transcript. Material is placed underneath the category to which it properly belongs. In cases of doubt, material is placed under

two or more categories. Every effort is made to incorporate all of the material into the reading guide, so that no testimony by the subject is lost.

The next and crucial step is to convert the reading guide into a *coded reading guide*. This step involves a radical condensation and categorization of the interview material. In this case, the reading guide itself is coded and the text reorganized under 11 distinct headings. These headings, or *codes*, are derived both inductively and deductively; they develop from pre-determined interests as well as ongoing observations. The material under the headings is labeled so that one can return to the reading guide and, if necessary, to the original transcript. However, for all practical purposes, the remaining data analysis is done on the *coded reading guide*.

Once the reading guide has been coded, it is possible to ask numerous questions of the data. Some of these questions are essentially descriptive (e.g. what are the major “larger purposes” described by journalists); some involve simple counts (e.g. how many subjects mention mentors or “anti-mentors”); some involve proportions (e.g. what proportion of reported strategies involve mastering of the domain); some involve points on a scale (e.g. is a change that is taking place in the domain seen as positive, negative or neutral).

Ultimately, the power of the analysis resides significantly in the exploration of relationships among variables. We want to know, for example, the relationship between having a mentor and the likelihood of adopting certain kinds of strategies when one is confronted by obstacles. Sometimes we will simply report the numerical incidence; sometimes it will prove possible to carry out inferential statistics; sometimes

we will present more dynamic portraits, in which we will hypothesize a pathway of relationships among several variables.

In general, the ways in which we have blocked subjects function as independent variables (i.e. gender, age group, and role within the profession). It should be noted that some of the factors we are looking at can be construed as dependent or as independent variables. For example, having a mentor is generally seen as an independent variable; however, it may turn out that certain childhood experiences (e.g. loss of a parent) make it more likely that one will have a mentor. We remain open to these shifting relationships among variables.

The goal is to create a rich data base that can be mined in many ways in the future. This early work is directed primarily at understanding how individuals deal with obstacles that prevent their realization of their goals. We are particularly interested in how certain individuals succeed in devising strategies that are creative and responsible. However, our coding of the data is such that future researchers will be able to return to this material to investigate many other questions as well.

a) Coding step 1: creation of a reading guide

As noted, once it has been reviewed and approved by the subject, the transcript is transformed into a reading guide. The contents are preserved but regrouped so that subjects' responses appear under the appropriate headings. For example, questions and answers relating to contemplation are regrouped under the heading of contemplation, no matter at which point in the interview they initially emerged. Similarly, responses

related to formative influences, training and mentoring are regrouped under these respective headings, no matter where they were originally offered.

Regrouping the transcript into a reading guide can be considered a first level of coding. To some extent the conversion of the transcript to reading guide is a mechanical process, but to some extent it is not. A subject may appear to be talking about training but may actually be providing important information as well about his goals or overall purpose. It is important that this information be placed under the most appropriate heading. A safeguard is to place material quite liberally under more than one heading.

b) Coding step 2: coding the reading guide

The most crucial step in the data analysis entails coding of a reading guide (which is as lengthy as the original transcript). The coded reading guide contains 3-5 pages of information arrayed on 10-20 coding sheets. To get a feeling for what the subject is like, one rereads the transcripts or the reading guide. To conceptualize the subject in terms of the principal variables of the study, the coder consults the coding manual as sections of the transcript are underlined. The coding manual is a document that contains coding instructions as well as precise definitions and examples of our 11 codes. Definitions of codes as seen in the coding manual are included below.

Coders underline all statements from the reading guides that meet a code definition and place these excerpts on the coding sheets. For the sake of convenience, these lines are color coded (e.g. goals in red, strategies in blue, obstacles in green). Coders are

asked to be very cautious about making inferences, even when these have been articulated by the interviewer during the course of the conversation. In general, subjects must be allowed to speak for themselves and the coding is based upon the written record.

When the coding has been completed, information about the subject has been organized into our 11 separate categories. In what follows, we list each of the categories, indicate its scope, and describe some of the considerations that underlie coding decisions.

Independent Variables: Subject is described in terms of media type (print, broadcast, internet or documentary); role/constituency (creator/leader; gatekeeper; midlevel practitioner); gender; age (in five year groupings); and racial/ethnic group (African American, Hispanic American, Asian American, White American).

Larger Purpose: Coders comb the reading guide for the passage(s) which best describes the “larger purpose” or ultimate goal or (“mission”) of the work of the professional as it relates to others. In the coding manual, Larger Purpose is defined as “doing for Other(s); going beyond self interest.” Among journalists, common goals would be “to present what has happened as objectively as possible,” “to help individuals make sense of the fast changing world,” “to play a constructive part in the democratic process.” It is possible that no larger purpose is discovered, in which case this category is scored as None.

Larger purposes can be further described as universalistic (applicable to all individuals) or particularistic (oriented especially to a group). Common universalistic

purposes include truth and fairness. Among particularistic responses, subjects speak about a desire to deliver news to a particular constituency (e.g. African Americans) or to reach a specific group (young individuals, individuals who are remote from the center of power).

Purposes can be described in terms of informing an audience (transmitting the news more quickly and more accurately; conveying educational stories to a wider constituency); or in terms of being influential (giving voice or empowering a certain group; righting injustices against a certain group).

Goals, Obstacles, Strategies: In terms of our current conception of good work, these three categories are not only the most important ones in our study, but also the ones that occupy the largest section of the coding sheets. For each subject we identify several goals, principal obstacles that threaten to thwart attainment of goals, and the strategies devised by subjects to handle such obstacles. The strategies identified are particularly relevant to our ultimate effort to train young professionals in the spirit of good work. Sometimes the goals, obstacles, and strategies are directly aligned with one another; sometimes goals and obstacles are stated in isolation and are so recorded on the coding sheets. In our coding scheme, strategies can only be coded if there is an associated goal.

- *Goals* are further described in terms of their focus on the self (e.g., meeting one's own standards; being successful; maintaining one's own integrity) or focusing on others (educating the audience, taking care of one's children). We also note if the

goal is considered part of the larger purpose that has been identified in category #2.

- *Obstacles* are further described in terms of the primary sphere in which they appear: generated by self (e.g. one's own shyness or perfectionism); emerging from the domain or field (shift to electronic communication, increased competition in the news media market); emerging from the work place (a demanding boss; hostile policy of the company that owns the newspaper); emerging from the wider society (a less literate populace; lowered attention span of audience); or some other source.

We have also categorized obstacles by their specific content: time pressure, management conflicts, personnel weaknesses, financial constraints, profit demands, a subject's qualities that hinder work, personal ethical concerns, and negative critique of the audience.

6. *Strategies* are approaches or actions taken by subjects to support an intended outcome, or goal. They should be teachable or trainable. Strategies are further described in terms of three sets of dimensions:

Content: Strategies may reflect Internal principles (“My fundamental tenet is having respect for others; I listen to an internal voice”); Domain mastering (“I learned to use the World Wide Web as soon as it was available; I always write three drafts and run them by an expert”); Domain expanding (“When I could no longer achieve my purposes at the newspaper, I started an internet service

with three close colleagues; To my knowledge I was the first person to have interpretive news stories labeled as such”).

Action: Subjects may respond to obstacles in various ways--Preemptive strategy (I refused to cover any stories having to do with the sex lives of politicians; I simply don't serve on boards); Reactive strategy (After covering one such story, I asked to be transferred to the foreign desk; I complained about the practice but it did not do any good); Proactive strategy (I focused my story on the president's speech rather than his peccadilloes and I got away with it); Passive acceptance (I did not like to cover private lives but I realized that is what the audience wanted and so I did it).

Origin: When a subject clearly indicated the source from where he or she learned a given strategy, we noted that its 'origin' was traceable.

Opportunities, Obstacles into Opportunities: The next set of categories complements the identification of obstacles and strategies. The focus here falls on the opportunities that arise and the ways that subjects make use of them.

We capture incidents where subjects convert obstacles into opportunities and further characterize how the subject is affected by the obstacle (e.g. the print journalist treats the rise of broadcast journalism as an opportunity to cover stories with a depth that is not possible in broadcasts). We code if the subject sees himself as strengthened, changed or inspired by the obstacle.

We also record when a subject speaks of taking advantage of an opportunity (e.g. subject receives a fellowship and uses it as an opportunity to enroll in courses in law

school). We further classify how the opportunity came about--did the subject's networking in the domain lead to the opportunity; did she take initiative and create it? Or, did she draw on personal connections, such as family or friends, to open up the opportunity?

Supports: We record when persons or institutions have offered significant support at work or at home. We indicate whether the support was derived from a professional relationship or from a more personal source, such as a spouse.

Transforming Moments: We note moments or experiences that seem to be pivotal or transforming for a subject's career (the subject has the opportunity to work with a master journalist; covers a pivotal story and receives wide attention; (re)discovers religious faith).

Changes in the Domain, Field, Workplace, or Society: Of interest are the important changes in the conditions of work that have impressed the subject. These can be changes at the workplace, in the domain or the field, or in the broader society. We have subdivided changes in terms of whether they principally concern technology (computers, satellites); values (what counts as good foreign coverage after the downfall of communism and the triumph of the market economy); format (new ways of reporting or editing the news); rewards (journalists hired on the basis of physical appearance or advanced degrees rather than reporting experience), or Other. Finally, with respect to each change, we have coded the subject's overall evaluation of the change as positive, negative, (if no evaluation is given) neutral, or other.

Involvement in the Domain: We ascertain the time at which the subject first had a serious involvement with the profession. Such initial contact could occur at his family home, at school, on the job, or at some other site (e.g. summer camp, the military). Similarly, we pinpoint the time of this involvement as childhood/adolescence, college age, adulthood, ongoing, or other.

Formative Influences: Subjects denote those persons, groups, or activities that exerted the most influence on their development, with special reference to choice of careers. We categorize these influences in terms of time (childhood/adolescence; college age; adulthood; ongoing); and source (family, friends or peers, teachers or coaches, coursework, professional relationships, religious experiences, sports or physical involvement, artistic pursuits, the act of reading/writing, people admired, political/cultural climate, and other). We also record when a formative influence is specifically related to the domain or clearly linked to a subject's professional work.

Mentors and Anti-Mentors: We catalogue individuals who served either as mentors or anti-mentors (unappealing individuals from whom the subjects strive to differentiate themselves). These mentors can be further broken down into those with whom the individuals worked directly; those contemporaries who were known second-hand; and figures from the past who serve as paragons.

Contemplative Activities: If contemplative activities are described, we subdivide them into religious/spiritual, secular (keeping a journal, travel, listening to music), physical (swimming, jogging, playing racquetball). We further characterize the

secular reflective activities as language-based, or relating to travel or physical movement.

3. Training of Coders and Reliability Issues

We trained 12 coders across the three research labs. Training involved ongoing discussions and testing to refine and clarify codes. We conducted several reliability tests in each lab, whereby each person coded the same randomly selected passages in order to compare codes. Using our reliability tests to diagnose misunderstanding and lack of clarity, we were able to pinpoint codes that needed further refining. The coding manual itself was updated as more precise definitions emerged. Additional training sessions were held after every revision of our coding scheme.

After the 12 coders submitted their “coded reading guides,” we assigned pairs of coders, called 'sub-teams,' responsible for the data selected for a given code. Each sub-team read over all coded data for its group of codes, further narrowed the definitions of the codes, and re-categorized data when appropriate. All but one of the sub-teams achieved agreement by reviewing the data as a pair and debated disagreements until consensus was achieved.

To deal with the large quantity of data for strategies and obstacles, rather than work in pairs, that sub-team took a slightly different approach. The data were broken up into thirds and each section was independently reviewed. To assure reliability, two reliability tests were conducted to calculate Cohen’s Kappa. Not surprisingly, given the difficulty of coding qualitative data, we found that it was very difficult to achieve

consistently high agreement among the three coders. Nonetheless, after several meetings to iron out differences in understanding, we were able to achieve moderate agreement among the three coders. For the strategy codes, three pairs of coders had moderate agreement on the following codes: Internalized Principle, Domain Mastering, and Domain Expanding. On our first reliability test the range for Cohen's Kappa was 0.48-0.63; and on our second reliability test the range for Cohen's Kappa was 0.47 to 0.62. From the first to the second tests, the Cohen Kappa scores were very stable which reveals a consistent level of understanding of these codes.

For our obstacles codes, we focused on improving our reliability on coding their 'spheres'--or where the obstacles seem to be located--whether the subject talked about a workplace, domain/field, individual, or social/cultural obstacle. For obstacles, the Cohen's Kappa for the three pairs of coders ranged from 0.26-0.64 on the first reliability test, and from 0.50 to 1.00 on the second test. A moderate level of agreement for the 'content' designation of the obstacles was harder to achieve. It was more difficult for the coders to reliably choose whether an obstacle was, for example, B1 'Time pressure,' or B2 'Management conflict.' The reliability statistic for the first test ranged from 0.26 to 0.48, and for the second test, 0.26-0.69. Because we could not consistently get mid-level statistics of at least 0.45 on these 'content' codes (one of the Cohen's Kappa statistics was as low as 0.26), we regard our content coding of the obstacles as unreliable.

4. From coded reading guides to data analysis and findings

Findings are obtained by an examination of the coded reading guides. In what follows, we indicate the types of findings that can emerge from a study of this sort. The present list is not intended to be exhaustive and it will no doubt be changed and expanded as the study continues.

Simple Counts of Variables of Interest: How many subjects had mentors? Or, “anti-mentors”? How many subjects became involved in journalism through work on their high school newspapers? How important were certain figures (Edward R. Murrow, Bob Woodward and Carl Bernstein; George Orwell) and certain exemplary organizations (CBS News, the New York Times)?

Proportions: Some subjects list many strategies, some fewer. The number of strategies is of some interest in itself. However it may be important to look at strategies in terms of proportions: what percentage of strategies are domain mastering, for example, and what percentage are domain expanding. This question can be posed on an individual subject basis and on a group basis (e.g. men vs. women; creators vs. gatekeepers).

Independent/Dependent Variable Relations: Many issues lend themselves to analysis in terms of a straightforward investigation of the relation between independent and dependent variables. For instance, the orientation toward domain mission may differ, depending on one’s role in the profession. Thus, one could hypothesize that midlevel practitioners are more likely to have an instrumental purpose, while gatekeepers are more likely to have a purpose that is tied to the

mission of the domain. Or one could hypothesize that men are more likely to have universalistic purposes and women are more likely to have particularistic ones. Simple statistical tests (e.g. chi square) can be used to test these and similar hypotheses.

Ad Hoc Correlations: Various unanticipated relations suggest themselves. For instance: the relationship between unusual entry into journalism (e.g. no training, straight from the CIA) and willingness to use domain-expanding strategies. It is unlikely that there will be sufficient subjects to carry out statistical tests, but it is still possible to monitor such possibly important correlations and, eventually, to make comparisons across domains.

Ad Hoc Phenomena: Various unexpected phenomena have emerged: the number of individuals who believe that they were stimulated to improve themselves and their work through the negative comments of an anti-mentor; the paradox that family-owned newspapers have much more flexibility and openness than those that are owned by a corporation. Again, while statistical tests are not possible, it is important to monitor and attempt to explicate such phenomena.

Qualitative Analyses: Some of the most important analyses are qualitative in nature: that is, they do not lend themselves to counts or to statistical tests. Rather they will more closely resemble ethnographic investigations. Among the analyses we expect to carry out are these:

5. The Creation of Prototypes or “Ideal Types”.

Based on subjects who embody factors in a powerful way, we expect to create prototypes. For example, we might describe the Classic Reporter: the individual trained on the beat, as part of a distinguished lineage, who learned to look the subjects of his stories directly in the eye and who now devotes time to the training of young journalists. Or the Glamorous Broadcast Anchor person: he or she entered broadcast journalism following a career as an entertainer and had to change appearance and self-presentation repeatedly to maintain high ratings in the sweepstakes. Of interest will be how such individuals react when confronted with a dramatic change in their chosen domain.

7. Opportunistic Case Studies.

We may be able to conduct case studies of events that crystallize issues of good work. For example, the situation where French doctors knowingly sanctioned the sale of blood that was tainted with HIV virus; the decision to publish the name of Richard Jewell, when there was no credible evidence that he was linked to the bomb that went off at the 1996 Atlanta Olympics; the resignation of Chicago-based broadcast journalist Carol Marin, when the management of her television station decided to hire a controversial talk show host as a commentator on the evening news; the decision of ABC news to pose as food workers in order to uncover irregularities in a supermarket’s packaging of meat.

Such prototypes and case studies will allow us to develop models of the variables that underlie the emergence of behavior that exemplifies or violates good

work. In some instances we will be able to test these models with our own data; in other instances, abstractions from our studies will lend themselves to investigation by other researchers in the future.

Comparisons Across Domains: Once we have studied more than one domain, we are able to make comparisons across domains. For example, it will be instructive to compare the persons or institutions to which/whom the journalists feel themselves responsible, as compared to those invoked by artists or geneticists. Such comparisons are a mainstay of the book Good Work, which we plan to publish in 2001.

Comparisons Across Studies: Since the basic interview is being used in several associated studies, we will be able to compare subjects at different stages of development. For example, we can compare the goals of talented artists who are still children, individuals who are beginning their professional careers in the arts, and those who have become creator/leaders.

International Comparisons: Issues of good work arise wherever individuals are allowed to carry out innovative work. We expect to be richly informed by comparisons with other societies and cultures. Already from our reading of the transcripts from Latvia, it is apparent that creativity has an entirely different connotation in a society that, for most of the century, was not permitted to engage in creative activity. Under such circumstances, there is understandable suspicion of any attempts to curtail or channel that creativity.

8. Possibility of more streamlined data reduction

As should be evident, the steps delineated above constitute an extremely time consuming process. For a first study of a first domain, all of this work was probably necessary. Ultimately, however, it may prove possible—and it would certainly be desirable—to streamline the process. For example, keeping all of the 11 variables in mind, one might reduce the transcript to a 4-5 page narrative, and code directly from this narrative. We are also considering ways to develop more targeted codes, hence reducing the number of categories and sub-categories. At present, we have made some adjustments to our procedures. For example, we now go directly from the transcript to the coding, eliminating the reading guide entirely. We have also adopted Nudist, a qualitative software program that organizes the coding online and helps us consider possible relationships among variables more easily. We will continue to develop these and other approaches as we continue to improve our methods and further elaborate our findings.

Appendix A- Written Q-sort

Date _____

We are interested in learning what kinds of things are important to people working in your profession. Think about the importance of each item to you, in your professional life; to what extent does it guide you in your work?

Please read each item, and decide whether you think it is of Below Average, Average, or Above Average importance in guiding your work. Indicate your decision with a check mark in the appropriate one of the three middle *shaded* columns. Rate 10 of the items Below Average, 10 of the items Average, and 10 of the items Above Average. When you have rated all 30 items, please review your ratings to see that you have checked 10 items in each column.

Now look at the 10 items you have rated Below Average. Of these ten items, please identify the four that are least important. Indicate your decision by placing a check mark by each item in the *unshaded* column labeled "Least Important."

Please do the same for the 10 items you rated Above Average. Of these ten items, identify the four that are most important, and indicate your decision by placing a check mark by each item in the *unshaded* column labeled "Most Important."

	Least Important	BELOW AVERAGE	AVERAGE	ABOVE AVERAGE	Most Important
	4 items	10 items	10 items	10 items	4 items
BROAD INTERESTS					
CHALLENGE					
COURAGE, RISK TAKING					
CREATING BALANCE IN ONE'S LIFE (moderation)					
CREATIVITY, PIONEERING (originality, imaginativeness)					
CURIOSITY					
EFFICIENT WORK HABITS					
FAITH					
FAME, SUCCESS					
HARD WORK AND COMMITMENT					
HONESTY AND INTEGRITY					
INDEPENDENCE					
ENJOYMENT OF THE ACTIVITY ITSELF					
OPENNESS (being receptive to new ideas or multiple perspectives)					
PERSONAL GROWTH AND LEARNING					
POWER, INFLUENCE					
PROFESSIONAL ACCOMPLISHMENT					
PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT					
QUALITY (excellent, thorough, accurate, or careful work)					
RECOGNITION FROM ONE'S FIELD					
REWARDING AND SUPPORTIVE RELATIONSHIPS (with family, friends, colleagues)					
SEARCHING FOR KNOWLEDGE; UNCOVERING WHAT IS TRUE					

SELF-EXAMINATION, SELF-CRITICISM, SELF-UNDERSTANDING					
SOCIAL CONCERNS (pursuing the common good; avoiding harm; caring about future generations)					
SOLITUDE, CONTEMPLATION					
SPIRITUALITY					
TEACHING, MENTORING					
UNDERSTANDING, HELPING, OR SERVING OTHERS					
VISION (anticipating future directions, seeing the big picture)					
WEALTH, MATERIAL WELL-BEING					
	(4 items)	(10 items)	(10 items)	(10 items)	(4 items)

Now think about the importance of these items to you as a person; that is, in terms of your life in general and not just professionally. Please circle the four items which you feel are most important to you as a person.

BROAD INTERESTS
CHALLENGE
COURAGE, RISK TAKING
CREATING BALANCE IN ONE'S LIFE (moderation)
CREATIVITY, PIONEERING (originality, imaginativeness)
CURIOSITY
EFFICIENT WORK HABITS
FAITH
FAME, SUCCESS
HARD WORK AND COMMITMENT
HONESTY AND INTEGRITY
INDEPENDENCE
ENJOYMENT OF THE ACTIVITY ITSELF
OPENNESS (being receptive to new ideas or multiple perspectives)
PERSONAL GROWTH AND LEARNING
POWER, INFLUENCE
PROFESSIONAL ACCOMPLISHMENT
PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT
QUALITY (excellent, thorough, accurate, or careful work)
RECOGNITION FROM ONE'S FIELD
REWARDING AND SUPPORTIVE RELATIONSHIPS (with family, friends, colleagues)
SEARCHING FOR KNOWLEDGE; UNCOVERING WHAT IS TRUE
SELF-EXAMINATION, SELF-CRITICISM, SELF-UNDERSTANDING
SOCIAL CONCERNS (pursuing the common good; avoiding harm; caring about future generations)
SOLITUDE, CONTEMPLATION
SPIRITUALITY
TEACHING, MENTORING
UNDERSTANDING, HELPING, OR SERVING OTHERS
VISION (anticipating future directions, seeing the big picture)
WEALTH, MATERIAL WELL-BEING

We are interested in learning what kinds of things you see as being important to others working in the news media. Think about how important each item is to others in your field (people overall, a typical person), in their professional lives; to what extent does it guide them in their work?

Please read each item, and decide whether you think it is of Below Average, Average, or Above Average importance to others in guiding their work. Indicate your decision with a check mark in the appropriate one of the three middle *shaded* columns. Rate 10 of the items Below Average, 10 of the items Average, and 10 of the items Above Average. When you have rated all 30 items, please review your ratings to see that you have checked 10 items in each column.

Now look at the 10 items you have rated Below Average. Of these ten items, identify the four that are least important. Please indicate your decision by placing a check mark by each item in the *unshaded* column labeled "Least Important."

Please do the same for the 10 items you rated Above Average. Of these ten items, identify the four that are most important, and indicate your decision by placing a check mark by each item in the *unshaded* column labeled "Most Important."

	Least Important	BELOW AVERAGE	AVERAGE	ABOVE AVERAGE	Most Important
	4 items	10 items	10 items	10 items	4 items
BROAD INTERESTS					
CHALLENGE					
COURAGE, RISK TAKING					
CREATING BALANCE IN ONE'S LIFE (moderation)					
CREATIVITY, PIONEERING (originality, imaginativeness)					
CURIOSITY					
EFFICIENT WORK HABITS					
FAITH					
FAME, SUCCESS					
HARD WORK AND COMMITMENT					
HONESTY AND INTEGRITY					
INDEPENDENCE					
ENJOYMENT OF THE ACTIVITY ITSELF					
OPENNESS (being receptive to new ideas or multiple perspectives)					
PERSONAL GROWTH AND LEARNING					
POWER, INFLUENCE					
PROFESSIONAL ACCOMPLISHMENT					
PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT					
QUALITY (excellent, thorough, accurate, or careful work)					
RECOGNITION FROM ONE'S FIELD					
REWARDING & SUPPORTIVE RELATIONSHIPS (with family, friends, colleagues)					
SEARCHING FOR KNOWLEDGE; UNCOVERING WHAT IS TRUE					
SELF-EXAMINATION, SELF-CRITICISM, SELF-UNDERSTANDING					
SOCIAL CONCERNS (pursuing the common good; avoiding harm; caring about future generations)					
SOLITUDE, CONTEMPLATION					
SPIRITUALITY					
TEACHING, MENTORING					
UNDERSTANDING, HELPING, OR SERVING OTHERS					
VISION (anticipating future directions, seeing the big picture)					
WEALTH, MATERIAL WELL-BEING					
	(4 items)	(10 items)	(10 items)	(10 items)	(4 items)

Appendix B

Definitions of Constituencies

1. Creator/Leaders: Understanding how professional leaders do their work, what driving force propels their work, and how they perceive changes in their profession is crucial to our study. Individual leaders wield powerful influence through their setting of precedents and standards. Leaders, of course, are not always highly creative in their work. However, we will seek leaders who have, through their innovative practices and creative accomplishments, shifted the entire direction of a domain.

2. Gatekeepers: We see gatekeepers as a powerful force in running, maintaining, and enabling risk-taking within institutions. Gatekeepers have the ability to influence the standards of the domain by determining what kind of work and which workers are considered to be acceptable or innovative. Their work often includes: 1) Hiring, firing, and assigning, 2) Controlling means of discourse in the field, 3) Allocating resources, 4) Evaluating work, 5) Determining who gets recognized.

3. Mid-level practitioners: We also seek to investigate the beliefs and practices of professionals who make up a majority of the professions. These practitioners can be strongly affected by the emergence of innovative practices, and the decisions of gatekeepers in the domain. Mid-level practitioners are ordinary citizens who are not high-level gatekeepers or leaders, e.g. daily reporters. These mid-level practitioners have worked for at least five years in the field, are not famous on a national level (but can be well-known locally), and are not necessarily moving up in the ranks of their fields.

Appendix C Profile of the Coded Journalism Sample

Total # of coded media subjects: 60

Media Type:

29 print
21 broadcasters
5 internets
4 documentarians

Constituency:

Creator/leader: 27
Gatekeepers: 13
Mid-level: 20

Race	# of women	# of men	Total
White Amer	15	31	46
Asian Amer.	1	0	1
African Amer.	5	4	9
Hispanic/Latino	3	1	4
Total gender	24	36	TOTAL: 60

Age	Creator/Leader	Gatekeeper	Mid-level
30-35			1
36-39			6
40-45	5	1	10
46-49	6	3	2
50-55	5	3	1
56-59	3		3
60-65	2		2
66-69	1	2	3
70-75	3	1	4
76-79	1	2	3
80-85	1	1	2
Total	27	13	20

Age groupings:

30-45 = 23 subjects

46-65 = 25 subjects

66-85 = 12 subjects

Appendix D Interview Questions for Good Work Study

Version 16.0- Core1- Media

I. Opening: Goals and Purposes

1. What kinds of things are you trying to accomplish in your work right now?
2. Is there a goal in your work that gives meaning to what you do that is essential to making your work worth-while?
 - a. What is it?
 - b. Why is this goal important?
 - c. Are there other comparable ones?
 - d. How do you know when they have been met?
3. In your work, to what or to whom do you feel responsible or loyal?

II Beliefs and Values

4. Are there specific qualities that have contributed to your achievements?
(qualities = attributes: e.g. determination, persistence)
 - a. Qualities that hinder achievements?
5. Which of your personal beliefs contribute to your achievements?
(beliefs = world view: e.g. belief in truth, justice, fairness)
 - a. Personal beliefs that hinder your achievements?
6. Do you feel that your beliefs conflict with the dominant values in your area of work?
7. Would it be different if you were working on your own or in another organization?

III The Work Process (personal level)

8. What of your work are you most proud?
 - a. To what do you attribute your success in this endeavor?
 - b. May we have a copy of this work?
 - c. How important is creativity for your work?
 - d. What qualities are instrumental to your creative process?
 - e. What role does reflection play in your creative process?
 - f. What qualities inhibit your creative process?
 - g. Is it necessary to take risks?

IV Positive and Negative Pressures in Your Area of Work

9. Reasons that make it difficult for you to achieve your goals?

- a. Constraints of work place?
- b. Relate a specific situation?
- c. Unique to your area of work?
- d. Practical economic concerns/money?
- e. What roles do prestige and fame play?

For Gate Keepers: How do you approach the challenge of managing creative and ambitious people?

- a. *Are there incidents when you have to put priority on the institutional needs?*
- b. *Does this produce conflicts with individual needs of people working with you?"*

(Work Process: Institutional/Organizational level)

10. What kind of work is rewarded/discouraged?

- a. Is innovation/creativity rewarded?
- b. What are innovations that have changed your work process?
- c. How do you work differently from when you started?
- d. Does your job allow for time alone, to reflect?

Gate Keepers: What kind of work do you reward or discourage?

V Formative Background

Childhood/Adolescence

11. Reflecting on your formative years as a child or adolescent, what influences do you view as most salient in the way you approach your professional work?

- a. Influence of family background?
- b. How you spent your time as a child? What would a person have seen if they shadowed you for a day when you were a child?
- c. As a child, were you intensely involved in one or more activities? Which ones?
- d. Influential religious and spiritual factors?

12. Do you remember the first time you thought of yourself as a (subject's professions)?

Mentors/Training

13. What attracted you initially to your area of work?

14. Describe your training.

15. Have you had any mentors who have significantly influenced how you approach your work and/or how you have made crucial decisions in your career?

- a. An influential book, experience or project?
- b. Any "anti-mentors"?
- c. Weaknesses of your mentors?

VI Perspectives on your area of work

16. What do you like about your area of work? Dislike?

- a. What does your area of work do well, not so well?
- b. Example of a piece of work you respect, don't respect?
- c. If you were in a higher position of authority, how would you do things differently?
- d. What direction do you see for the future of your area of work?
For Mid-Level Practitioners: What direction do you see for the future of your own career
- e. Does your work serve the public?

Training the next generation

17. How well does your area of work train young people to have the qualities that you think are important? How would you train them differently?

- a. How would you advise a young person who is thinking about a career in your area of work?
- b. Promising or warning signs of a young person in your area of work?
- c. What would you change about young people in your area of work?
(Subject's work with young people)
- d. Is it important for you to work with young people?
- e. What's important for you to transmit through words or deeds?
- f. What are you learning from the people you mentor?

VII Community and Family Relationships

18. What do you consider to be your principal community(ies)?

- a. Do you retain ties with communities in which you grew up?
- b. Are you an active member of communities outside of work?
- c. To what extent is your family related to your work?
- d. How do you balance family/private life and work?
- e. Do religious or spiritual concerns play an important role in your life?

VIII Ethical Standards

19. Some people say that the standards in your area of work are more ethical than they used to be and some say they are less ethical. What has been your experience?

20. Can you tell me about an incident in your area of work where you weren't sure about the right course of action?

- a. How did it become clear to you what to do?
- b. How do you deal with beliefs/practices you disagree with?
- c. Has it become harder to do work that you consider to be responsible and ethical?

21. Are there things that you would not do in your profession, even though it is not illegal?

IX Closing

22. We are coming to the end of our interview, is there anything you would like to add?

a. Check notes for things left out

b. May I follow up with you in the future?