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About Us

LCSS was founded in 2004 by a diverse group of academics to generate thinking and debate amongst academics, activists, policy makers, practitioners, media and civil society organisations both at the national and international level. As a non-profit independent research organisation, LCSS uses social science research tools to address major social, political and economic issues such as migration, social cohesion, subjectivity, education, gender, human rights in a critical way.

LCSS has specialised competence on the issues of migration and education related research, especially due to its strong connection with UK based institutes and academics. We aim to create inter-disciplinary forums and cross-border networks to facilitate emergence of innovative approaches addressing major global policy challenges. Hundreds of academics, policy professionals and research students contribute to the development of our programmes, and over 14,000 subscribers follow our activities.

As well as original research contributions, our activities include public lectures, panel discussions, round-tables, conferences, workshops, policy papers, reports and a recently launched academic journal to strengthen links between leading actors in society and the wider public. Through our community projects, we aim to develop better understanding of the problems faced by various communities in Europe and the United Kingdom in particular. Our major community projects to date have been supported by the Big Lottery Fund and many other private UK-based and international institutions and funding bodies. We are also grateful to all individual donors for their continuous and generous support to our activities since LCSS’s establishment.
The Conference

The 5th LCSS PhD Methodology Conference will address the methodological issues in social sciences and humanities, with a particular focus on research paradigms and designs, research methods and techniques, research technology and tools, data sets, data collections, data archiving and research philosophy in Social Sciences and Humanities.

The conference series is an opportunity for PhD and early-career researchers from different disciplines to meet and share their valuable knowledge and research experiences. The conference provides an excellent opportunity for researchers to present their approaches to research paradigms and designs, research methods and techniques, research technology and tools, data sets, data collections and data archiving, research philosophy and in so doing to reflect and gain feedback on their studies. It also provides a forum in which research challenges can be explored and, hopefully, overcome.

This conference aims specifically to encourage and consider alternative tools and sources, covering a variation of methodologies and research design in the field of Social Sciences and Humanities. It shall also foster networking and researchers in similar areas to share and discuss their methodologies. This opportunity to present and discuss with renowned academics in their field and gain feedback from other students and scholars in the Social Sciences and Humanities area will contribute to the methodological choices, use of new technology/ tools, data sets, data collections and data archiving.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09:30-10:00</td>
<td>Arrivals, Registration &amp; Morning Refreshments (2.05a 2nd Floor)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00-10:15</td>
<td>WELCOME SPEECH (2.05c 2nd Floor)</td>
<td>Conference Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 10:15-11:00  | KEYNOTE I (2.05c 2nd Floor)                                           | Dr Maria Iacovou Director of Social Science Research Methods Centre, Reader in Quantitative Sociology, University of Cambridge - UK
*Data: Where Does It Come from and Why Does It Matter?* |
| 11:00-11:15  | Coffee Break 2.05a (2nd Floor)                                        |                                                                                                               |
| 11:15-12:30  | A1 – Doing Ethnography: Researching Online/Offline Spaces and Positionality 2.12 (2nd Floor) | Chair: Dr Cedric Gilson University of Westminster, Law School - UK
[1] Christina Fashanu University of Sheffield - UK
Collaboration through Comics: Opening up Spaces for Dialogue with Young Children.
[4] Hadeer Elshafie University of Sussex - UK
Connecting Digital and Real Spaces through Ethnographic Research.
[7] Shesha Kanta Pangeni Oslo and Akershus University College of Applied Science - Norway
Methodological Paradox: Connecting Online and Offline Research Space.
[9] Icram Serronh Middlesex University - UK
Standing on the Inside and Outside at Once; Complexities in the Researcher Position. |
| 11:15-12:30  | B1 – The Value of Interviewing and Case Study Research 2.13 (2nd floor) | Chair: Dr Maria Iacovou University of Cambridge, Social Science Research Methods Centre - UK
[2] Tongtong Zhao University of Leicester - UK
An Investigation into Gender Differences in Participation in Higher Education among Final Year Secondary School Students in Cameroon.
[3] Caitlin Walker Training Attention CIC - UK
Clean Interviewing: A Research Method for Keeping Your Stuff out and Gathering Their Stuff in.
[6] R M Chathurani – L K Rathnayaka University of Leicester - UK
[10] Aimilianos Sideris City University of London - UK
Combining Methods to Explore Men's Experience of Anger. |
| 11:15-12:30  | C1 – Researching Past and Present: The Use of Archival Documents 2.14 (2nd Floor) | Chair: Dr Marc Mason University of Westminster, Law School - UK
[5] Fakhar Bilal Royal Holloway University of London - UK
Creating Self Archives: Managing and Collecting Historical Data.
[18] Benjamin Thorne University of Sussex - UK
The Discourse of Legal Witnessing and Collective Memory: Lessons from the Archives of the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda.
[16] Nora Morocza Liverpool John Moores University - UK
Diplomacy with History - Methodological Approach. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12:30-13:30</td>
<td>Lunch Break 2.05a (2nd Floor)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:30-14:30</td>
<td>KEYNOTE II (2.05c 2nd Floor)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Prof Will Harvey</strong> Associate Professor of Management Studies, Director of ‘Business, Institutions and Policy’ Research Cluster, University of Exeter - UK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interviewing Elites, Working with Practitioners and Other Fieldwork Challenges.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:30-15:45</td>
<td>A2 - Methodological Choices and Mixed Research Methods: Challenges and Advantages</td>
<td>2.12 (2nd floor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chair: <strong>Prof Will Harvey</strong> Department of Management, University of Exeter - UK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[19] <strong>Gülcin Gümbez Dağ</strong> Middle East Technical University - Turkey A Tale of Two Paradigms: The Best of the Times for Quantitative and Qualitative Research.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:45–16:00</td>
<td>Coffee Break 2.05a (2nd Floor)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:00–16:45</td>
<td>KEYNOTE III (2.05c 2nd Floor)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Prof Lisa Webley</strong> University of Westminster, Law School - UK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reflection on Research Ethics as a Means to Design a Methodologically Robust Study.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:45–17:00</td>
<td>Closing Remarks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Keynote Speakers

Prof Lisa Webley
University of Westminster, Westminster Law School

Lisa Webley is Professor of Empirical Legal Studies and holds a Senior Research Fellowship at the Institute of Advanced Legal Studies University of London. She has extensively researched gender and diversity in the legal profession, which has included major collaborative research projects on the barriers and challenges faced by women and minority individuals within the profession and the role of women in law firms. She also conducts research on legal ethics, legal education and access to justice. Her work employs a range of qualitative and quantitative methods as well as doctrinal legal method. Most recently she has undertaken funded empirical research and consultancy for the Law Society of England and Wales and the Legal Services Board: she was asked to present her research on diversity in the profession at the Second Annual Conference of the Research Group on Legal Diversity at the American Bar Foundation in Chicago last year.

Lisa is a member of the Editorial Advisory Board for the journal Legal Ethics and is its UK Correspondent, and she is a member of the Academic Committee of the Civil Mediation Council and a member of the Interlaw Diversity Forum. She also serves on the Equality and Diversity Committee of the Law Society of England and Wales. She is a secretary elect of the International Association of Legal Ethics. She has previously published articles in the International Journal of the Legal Profession, the Journal of Law and Society, Legal Ethics, the Journal of Social Welfare and Family Law and Law in Context. You may find out more at:

http://westminster.academia.edu/LisaWebley

Lisa, with John Flood, is the UK co-director of the 21st Century Law Practice Summer School run in conjunction with Michigan State University College of Law Professors Renee Knake and Dan Katz and also partners with Knake and Katz to run ReInvent Law London. She is also co-director of the Centre on the Legal Profession at the University of Westminster.
Maria Iacovou is the Director of the Social Sciences Research Methods Centre at the University of Cambridge, responsible for delivering training in research methods to postgraduate students across a large number of disciplines in the University; she is also a Reader in the Department of Sociology. She takes an interdisciplinary approach to research, having trained as an economist, and having published across a range of other disciplines including demography, statistics and epidemiology. Her research interests are centred around family relationships, with a particular focus on cross-national differences in family forms.

Will conducts research, teaches and consults in the areas of reputation, leadership, talent management and migration. He has worked with pharmaceutical, healthcare, energy, mining, management consulting, executive search, local and national government, supranational, aviation and food organisations. He has studied, taught and worked with multiple organisations in Africa, Asia, Europe, North America and Oceania.

Will has published in top American, European and Asian journals in the fields of management, sociology, industrial relations and geography, and his research has been competitively funded by the Economic and Social Research Council, the Arts Council and various national governments.

Will is Director of Business, Institutions and Policy, which is a large multidisciplinary research cluster, as well as Director of Research of Organisation Studies. He is on the Advisory Board of British Expats in Life Sciences and a member of Council and Governor at Haileybury.

Will received a First-Class Honours degree from the University of Durham and an MPhil (with Distinction) and Ph.D from the University of Cambridge, where he was a Millennium Scholar. Will studied for a year at the University of California, Berkeley and was a Visiting Scholar at the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University.

Will received a Commonwealth and Canadian Government Fellowship at the University of British Columbia and a Research Fellowship at the University of Oxford. Before moving to Exeter, Will was a Lecturer at the University of Sydney Business School. He is an Honorary Associate Professor in Work and Organisational Studies at the University of Sydney.

Will is a Fellow of the Higher Education Academy and a Chartered Member of the Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development. He has taught undergraduate, postgraduate, MBA and EMBA students at the University of Cambridge, the University of Oxford, the University of British Columbia and the University of Sydney.

Administrative responsibilities
Director of the Business, Institutions and Policy research cluster
Director of Research in Organisation Studies
Abstracts

[Paper No 1]
Collaboration through Comics: Opening up Spaces for Dialogue with Young Children
Christina Fashanu, University of Sheffield -UK

Collaborative ethnography, developed by Lassiter and Campbell (Lassiter et al., 2004), attempts to address the inherent power imbalance between researcher and participant by emphasising the deliberate process of collaboration with the community being researched (Lassiter, 2005). Representing participants’ perspectives faithfully is a fundamental principle for collaborative ethnography. Collaboration is difficult to achieve, however, when the participants are young children who do not share a language with the researcher.

Here, I present an innovative methodological approach I developed during a twelve month, ESRC funded research project that aimed to explore the communicative practices of young children in a super-diverse, early years educational environment. During the research project I became increasingly concerned with issues of representation: whose voice was being heard, and was I accurately portraying the children’s perspectives? With these questions in mind, I adopted a collaborative ethnographic approach, however, in addition to writing field notes, I sketched cartoon strips of the events being observed and shared these with the children.

The presentation describes how the cartoons were used to overcome four key concerns for collaborative ethnography: ‘1) ethics and moral responsibility, 2) ethnographic honesty, 3) accessible writing, and 4) collaborative reading, writing and co-interpretation’ (Lassiter, 2012, pp. 427-428). The findings suggest that cartoons provide an accessible medium that opens up spaces for developing dialogue around the research process. This has important implications for any research that endeavours to listen to the participants’ perspectives, but where linguistic communication is impeded.

[Paper No 2]
An Investigation into Gender Differences in Participation in Higher Education among Final Year Secondary School Students in Cameroon
Tongtong Zhao, University of Leicester - UK

Over the past few decades, considerable effort has been made nationally and internationally to improve gender equality in education. Numerous studies have been conducted that focus on gender equality and widening participation (WP) in higher education. However, most of these studies are based in the Western context and comparatively modest attention has been paid to developing countries, particularly Cameroon in Sub-Saharan Africa.

This study is designed to investigate barriers to participation in higher education for final year secondary school students, with a particular focus on gender differences. Drawing on the work by Hyde (1993) and Gorard et al. (2007), the conceptual framework of this study considers five types of barriers to participation in higher education: economic, socio-cultural, institutional barriers, family and personal. In order to find out the gender differences in these barriers, explanatory sequential mixed method research design is adopted in this research. In the first stage, questionnaire is used to gain a general idea with reference to gender differences in their
perceived barriers to participation in higher education. The qualitative research in the next stage will use in-depth interviews to test and verify the quantitative conclusions.

The pilot study data show no significant difference among the attitudes towards receiving higher education in those samples. However, among the items that formed the social stereotypes variable, there were significant differences among male and female students. Female students tend to believe that women should stay in the family and do housework. This will be retested during the main study in which questionnaires data will be collected from about 1000 respondents and focus group interviews will be carried out with about 30 participants to gain an in-depth explanation.

[Paper No 3]

**Clean Interviewing: A Research Method for Keeping Your Stuff out and Gathering Their Stuff in**

Caitlin Walker, Training Attention CIC - UK

Qualitative research interviews are a core method of social science research and the interviewer’s primary tool is the ability to direct attention to relevant information via a question.

The value of the data gathered depends on both the quality of questions asked and of the attention paid to the answers (Rice, 1929). Empirical research shows that even a single word (especially a metaphor) or presupposition can materially ‘lead the witness’ (Loftus & Xanni 1975; Thibodeau & Boroditsky 2011). Data may then be subject to ‘acquiescence bias’ (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee & Podsakoff 2003) by the interviewee and ‘confirmation bias’ (Oswald & Grosjean, 2004) by the interviewer, resulting in a low ‘signal to noise’ ratio at best, and compromised validity at worst.

Clean Interviewing, an application of Clean Language (Grove & Panzer 1989, Lawley & Tompkins 2000), reduces unintended interviewer bias and protects the integrity of interviewee information (Tosey, Lawley & Meese 2014). Clean questions keep interviewees focused on the research topic but not at the expense of restricting or leading them (Linder-Pelz & Lawley 2016).

The paper aims to provide the research base for: (1) how bias is unintentionally introduced into an interview, (2) how to create ‘clean’ questions for research interviews; and (3) how to design and frame questions to maximise the provision of relevant information.

The paper will:
- distinguish between clean and leading questions based on real interview excerpts
- demonstrate research interviewing using clean questions
- support the reader to differentiate between clean questions and those containing leading presuppositions and metaphors.
[Paper No 4]

Connecting Digital and Real Spaces through Ethnographic Research
Hadeer Elshafie, University of Sussex - UK

What is a ‘site of research’? I used a case study that focused on citizen environmental action in post-revolution Cairo in order to combine traditional ethnographic tools with digital ethnography. My research design was based on the principle of ‘fluid research sites’. By this, I refer to ‘offline’ and ‘online’ spaces for citizen action. The former describes spaces that may be typically labelled physical or real. The latter is typically labelled virtual or digital. But, must they be situated at opposite ends of the spectrum? The majority of studies treat these sites as separate. While I agree they are distinguishable, I view them as connected by means organisational forms of action. When we attempt to de-essentialise these spaces and, instead view them as fluid, we allow ourselves to study citizenship from a different eye-level. I would like to present my philosophy and research design in order to share my experience with the difficulties I faced and how I overcame them. More importantly, I would like share my reflections on how this experience humbled me both as a researcher and person.

[Paper No 5]

Creating Self Archives: Managing and Collecting Historical Data
Fakhar Bilal, Royal Holloway University of London - UK

Historicity of the sources in their deterministic mood highlights the present and future course of events which are evaluated in the accepted patterns of life to make the mankind more learned and aware. Searching, collecting and arranging of material, particularly archival sources, is itself a herculean task which infuse the spirit of knowing for the recognition of self and others. In this regard the first and foremost duty is to preserve sources and present them to others. This paper is an initial and early attempt to highlight major sources in variety of categories available in the collection consisted of archival documents of Madrasa Khair ul Madaris of Multan before and after partition of the subcontinent to highlight the conundrum of gap between academia and sources for well in time delivery of valuable judgements to a significant part of society and generations.

[Paper No 6]

R M Chathurani - L K Rathnayaka, University of Leicester – UK

Research in accounting and development is now becoming an established field, its cultural political economy hue has made important theoretical developments in the field of critical accounting studies. Exploring these developments, this research aims to address how the state apparatuses, multitudes of controls and political and cultural institutions are linked in permeating an eclectic form of accounting for investment decisions in mega projects in Sri Lanka’s
development. Cultural political economy research in accounting has reported on a number of case studies to illustrate how political and cultural factors are relevant to understand the functioning (and mal-functioning) of management accounting and control system in developing counties. In particular, this agenda of research has enhanced our understanding of how these macro factors gave rise to unintended idiosyncrasies in the mundane practices of management accounting and controls. This development has extended not only the scope of political economy research in accounting, but also made an interesting contribution to political economy research in the social sciences by connecting the macro to the micro through the trails of complexities of accounting. This research takes this literature as a point of departure and puts mega projects in development in Sri Lanka to investigate how government accounting practices, investment decisions, auditing and control procedures, and cultural institutions are interrelated and, in turn, produce an eclectic form of development accounting. The notion of development accounting - as observed in the literature – encompasses spatially and historically varying calculative practices and accountability mechanisms operating at multitudes of the development discourses linked to state apparatuses, political and cultural spheres, and institutionalized practices of accounting.

[Paper No 7]
Methodological Paradox: Connecting Online and Offline Research Space
Shesha Kanta Pangeni, Oslo and Akershus University College of Applied Science - Norway

Because of the advancement in Information and Communication Technology (ICT), the Internet has been an important means for everyday life to the people of almost every discipline. Hine (2000) has articulated this phenomenon as an evolution of the Internet culture. Although, the Internet has opened wider space for research, conventional methodologies are still dominant in practice. There are some new methods proposed in connection to new space (virtual world) of research. For example, Virtual Ethnography, Netnography, Digital Ethnography and so on. However, these methods are not significantly divergent from original concept of ethnography. Likewise, Big Data research and Online Surveys are not significantly different from conventional quantitative techniques and paper based survey research. Neither new methods are closely associated nor deviated to, and from conventional quantitative or qualitative methods.

When “the more virtual the more real” (Woolgar, 2000) is considered true, methodologies applicable to real space of research can also be replicated to virtual space. In this line, emerging methodologies create paradox at practical level. Does the Internet as means of creating virtual world has power to alter methodologies of research? Or the perspectives of researchers have been altered with a factor of intervention called the Internet? Is it enough to follow single writer model or each researcher take account of methodologies themselves? What is the strength of data source to influence whole methodologies? It is true that the Internet has presented wider space for research play with multiple possibilities of locating data sources. However, the way scholars' polarizing arguments in favour of so called new methodologies needs critical discourse.

Therefore, this paper aims at raising critical discourse on overwhelming methodological paradox as the result of the ICT interventions in knowledge generation through research. Focus of the
discourse is placed to reveal the connection in between online and offline research space. In doing so, the paper is based on reviews of methodological books and articles that proposes new methods of research in connection to the Internet or ICTs. The paper draws conclusion with implication to future novice researchers so that they can select applicable method or take account of the methodologies of their choice for research with online and offline settings.

[Paper No 8]

**Using Labour Market Projections for Validating the Polarization Hypothesis**

Caroline Neuber Pohl, Federal Institute for Vocational Education and Training - Germany

It is often suggested that technological progress especially in the course of digitization will turn many routine tasks redundant, because they are easy to program and, therefore, replaceable by automated processes. This is said to result in job polarization, as these tasks are concentrated in the task profiles of the medium-skilled and middle-income earners. While there exist several studies, which present empirical evidence of job polarization for the labour market in the US and also the UK, its existence in Germany is disputed. Here, especially, the reduction of the medium-skilled segment, because of its sheer size and tradition, would have substantial consequences for the German labour market and education system.

Many studies focus on the estimation of routine task shares of occupation when assessing their risk of substitution. Interestingly, they come to different conclusions for many occupations. This can be primarily traced back to the usage of different data sources based on employee, employer or expert surveys. However, in an occupationally segmented labour market like Germany, the question of which occupations will exactly win or lose from digitization is at the very heart of determining whether job polarization will prevail.

Furthermore, the net employment effect always reflects a plethora of partly competing and partly reinforcing effects. It is important to look at the sectors in which the occupational group finds employment. The sector’s level of investments for a digital economy matter, as well as realized cost reductions, efficiency gains, or newly generated demand, which motivate these investments.

In order to evaluate, whether the different studies, available for the German labour market, actually indicate a polarization tendency, the analysis, therefore, should reflect the different concurrent effects and the interindustry relations. To do so, we incorporate the different measures for substitution risks in a labour market projection, which models the input/output dependencies of the economic sectors as well as hiring, wage setting, and occupational mobility behaviour, and observe the difference in labour market outcomes. For this, at first, we estimate the explanatory value of these measures for the employment dynamics of the sectors using national accounts and census data. This is a novel approach, which enables us to incorporate the measures directly as employment effects in the projection and make them comparable despite their different ranges. The results show that all but one study suggest an upgrading of skills in the future, rather than job polarization.
[Paper No 9]
Standing on the Inside and Outside at Once; Complexities in the Researcher Position
Icram Serroukh, Middlesex University -UK

When considering the insider/outsider debate (Ryan, Kofman & Aaron, 2011), my positionality as a British Muslim researcher exploring the conversion experiences of those joining and leaving Islam is key. Whilst I may be perceived as falling under both categories depending on the group being interviewed, as a Muslim currently within the faith and with no experience of having left Islam, gaining trust from my research participants goes beyond collecting rich data. Specifically, employing ex-Muslims as participants is surrounded with complexities as this group may be considered to be at risk in personal safety terms. The media have constructed a picture sensationalising this marginalised group and the threat faced by them as a consequence of their decision to leave the Islamic faith, as evident in a recent documentary transmitted on ITV (Exposure: Islam's Non-Believers, 2016). While the potential risks faced by those Muslims who leave Islam must not be underestimated, this paper will offer a reflection on the challenges faced by the researcher in conducting such sensitive research. My visible Muslim identity may arouse suspicion by both ex-Muslims and Muslims in terms of my motivations for this research. Accounting for how these factors impact the data collection is imperative and determines the precautions that need to be taken to minimise any harm to both researcher and research participants. Furthermore, understanding and negotiating my positionality within the semi-structured interviews is crucial to ensure quality data as for instance participants may withhold certain views for fear of being judged or to minimise causing offence. The paper will argue that establishing mutual trust and a safe space for the interview to take place is of utmost importance when approaching fieldwork.

[Paper No 10]
Combining Methods to Explore Men’s Experience of Anger
Aimilianos Sideris, City University of London -UK

The present paper explores how three different qualitative methods can come together, inform and complement each other: Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis (IPA), Discourse Analysis (DA), and Interactional Sociolinguistics (IS). My work examines the experience of anger in adult males in London. Data were collected using semi-structured, one-on-one face-to-face interviews with the participants, who were asked to present to me their experiences of anger and the significance these experiences hold for them. The three methods I am employing, therefore, tap onto different dynamics presented in my data: IPA is designed to explore the significance of lived
experience by engaging researcher and participant in a hermeneutic cycle, where the researcher tries to make sense of the participant trying to make sense of the experience. IPA is therefore this study’s main vehicle for the exploration of the experience. The data are essentially narratives – the participants are telling me stories about their experiences. Therefore, DA is brought into the analysis to explore the construction of these stories. Focus is fixed in particular to the participants’ texts internal and external relations; narrative positioning; and evaluation (in Fairclough’s terms) through marked discursive choices. My participants did not generate their stories in isolation, however; they did so in a room with me, virtually a stranger to them. Therefore, Interactive Sociolinguistics concerned with features like turn-taking, prosody and extra-linguistic items are relevant to the study, as they too contribute to the participants’ unfolding narratives. What is particularly interesting about this topic is that anger is considered a negative emotion, given its frequent link to anti-social behaviour and violence. By admitting such an experience, therefore, participants run the risk of losing face and of painting themselves in a negative light. This is also what makes the combination of the three methodologies so apt for this particular topic. This paper is therefore oriented to how participants negotiate the distance between their angry self and their calm self in their explorations of this experience. The experience itself, the way its presentation is constructed, and the way its presentation is delivered are seen as three sides of a hermeneutic triangle which aims to uncover the phenomenology of this emotion. Theoretical paradigms and [preliminary] results are employed to illustrate my points

[Paper No 11]
The ‘Rhizome’: Re-thinking Thought in Post-Structuralist Educational Research.

Michael Elliott, Liverpool John Moores University - UK

I seek to explore a more critically elaborated conception & understanding of the adoption & use of post-structuralist thought-thinking in my own doctoral research, particularly related to considerations of onto-epistemology, methodology, theoretical frameworks, and importantly, implications for the conduct of inquiry. I submit: dominant discourses in the academy are replete with alluring orthodoxy and paralysing received wisdom, such that all too often we may fail to engage critically with, or more worryingly, fail to practically value deep and provocative reflection on the onto-epistemological provenance of our thinking, subsequent methodologic choices and knowledge we presume to produce. We may succumb to a “schooled insensitivity” (Hodgson, 2004, pp. 492) to or sophistic prima-facie engagement with these perplexing issues only further malmourishing not simply understandings of the practical implications for our work, but the nature of knowledge we seek to produce as it, and we alongside, become unwittingly subsumed by the very thing we seek to destabilise. There is no ‘re-thinking of thought’. To address this problematic in my own work, I selectively draw on the concept of the “rhizome” (Deleuze & Guttari, 2007 [1987]) as a generative thinking tool with respect to engaging in a critical exploration of the choices & rationales through which my own doctoral research by the name of post-structuralism is conceived, constructed and conducted. Through a discussion of my engagement with the philosophical imaginary of the “rhizome” (ibid), I offer a ‘re-thinking’ of the research act; concerned with examining and promoting notions of heterogeneity, multiplicity & connection, and working ‘nomadically’ amid the tangled assemblage of researcher, research
act and knowledge constructed. This philosophic-methodologic excursus through the kaleidoscopic lens of post-structuralist thinking, I believe, has encouraged a more radically expansive ‘re-thinking of thought’ in my own research. It is hoped that through these challenging explorations with the ‘rhizome’ I, and others, may continue to gain fresh insight into methodological thought, further opening the possibility spaces for thinking/doing differently to emerge. Grappling with these slippery issues and “putting rhizome to work” (Sellers, 2015, pp. 29) in our work, we may move towards deconstructing prevailing discourses in research practice in pursuit of something ‘new’. Let us (re)orient our thinking towards more critically engaged and alter perspectives, and approaches to, the choice and use of methodology, theoretical frameworks and methods in our research - let us attempt to ‘re-think thought’.

[Paper No 12]
Can Laboratory Setting Experiments Provoke Real Emotions? Exploring the Limitations of Experimental Research Design in a Marketing PhD
Rachael Millard, Queen Mary University of London - UK

“The primary virtue of the approach lies in its ability to ascertain unambiguously a causal relation between variables” Bagozzi (1977, p209).
As Bagozzi (1977) suggests, an experimental setting offers a unique opportunity to test a hypothesised causal relationship whilst controlling for other factors, but can an experiment be too controlled? Is it possible to elicit a true response when the environment is overall somewhat contrived? This is a problem facing emotions researchers particularly those with a marketing-centric focus. This research concentrates on one particular emotion: surprise. Surprise is universal yet subjective, high-arousal yet fleeting and both positive and negative. This research aims to understand the process of experiencing surprise; what drives it, how we feel and its consequences.
To explore these three areas, this research comprises different studies intending to further current understanding of surprise. The first involves multi-item scale development to produce a valid and reliable measure, the second considers the potential presence of a surprise threshold and the third accounts for the effects of surprise.
A 2014 overview of surprise in the marketing literature by Hutter and Hoffmann indicates that an experimental research methodology is by far the most common design for this type of study though certain authors recognise its limitations. Whilst recording participant reactions to both positive and negative surprise, Vanhamme (2000) alluded to the experimental laboratory as not being indicative of a real life setting. Houston, Childers and Heckler (1987) consider the effect of surprise on recall and suggest that people may be more open to express their emotions and so responses may be less forced in a more relaxed setting as the environment in which the experiment is conducted could impact upon involvement and motivation. In addition to this, inducing an emotional response raises the issue as to whether that is an experienced or evaluative emotion. This distinction is critical when interpreting and reporting findings. Therefore, perhaps the main obstacle facing this research is convincing readers of the
generalizability of results. Randomisation is a key component in achieving this (Levitt and List, 2007), and awareness of the limitations associated with experimental research design is paramount. However, as regards viable alternatives, experimental methodology is an efficient approach. Through a series of carefully planned, sequenced studies, this research aims to avoid the potential disadvantages of experimental research design whilst attempting to invoke a natural emotional response from participants, representative of feelings in a more natural setting.

[Paper No 13]
Testing Complex Theories with Causal Mediation Analysis – The Significance of Assumptions and Identification
Krisztián Pósch, London School of Economics and Political Science - UK

The majority of social scientists work with relatively complex causal theories to describe the social world. In such theories there is usually a cause (a treatment or exposure) from which one or multiple pathways can lead to one or multiple outcomes. In these situations analysts often distinguish between the indirect effect(s) that was/were transmitted through one or multiple mediators, and the direct effect of the treatment/exposure on the outcome(s) that was/were not transmitted through any of these mediating variables. Conventionally, structural equation modelling (SEM) has been used as a vehicle for this effect decomposition. Yet this traditional SEM approach has several limitations that are often overlooked by applied researchers. The presentation will discuss an alternative called causal mediation analysis which is capable of overcoming many of these pitfalls. The main focus will be on the required assumptions for the identification of the causal effects, as they are the essential but usually neglected first step to be considered before the analysis.

Firstly, a single mediator case will be briefly overviewed with comparisons to SEMs. Then cases with multiple mediators will be discussed, distinguishing between four major categories: (a) causally independent mediators, (b) joint effects of mediators, (c) mediators with post-treatment confounding, and (d) causally ordered mediators. The presentation will show how the underlying assumptions need to be modified given each category and how SEMs can be improved to address them. Throughout the presentation procedural justice policing and police legitimacy will be used as a motivating example. As more and more social scientists engage with causal analysis, this presentation aims to highlight the importance of being rigorous about the underlying assumptions while providing new ways to tackle indirect effects.
While quantitative paradigm following the positivist tradition seeks to provide causal explanations considering the objective character of social reality, the qualitative paradigm, is related with epistemological stances of knowing reality through experience, empathizing the relativist character, as well as the interpretivist and social construction of reality (Johnson, 2014; Read & Marsh, 2002; Johnson & Gray, 2010).

Mixed methods approach helps to compensate some of the limitations and weaknesses of both quantitative and qualitative methods alone, while enhancing the strengths of both since its use is intended to expand the scope or breadth of research, as well as to understand in depth the complexities under study by using statically and qualitative techniques (Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2003; Creswell, 2014; Blake 1989; Greene, Caracelli & Graham 1989, Rossman & Wilson 1991; cited in Driscoll et al., 2007). An additional advantage of combining insights and procedures of both methods in a mixed method approach concerns the chance of combine macro and micro structural ways of understanding society (Giddens, 1976; Neale, 1995). Thus, human agency, subjective experience and personal understanding are as important as structural 'external' factors concerning social circumstances.

Regarding the intertwined relationship of crime and homelessness, previous studies have assessed that most of the quantitative research done has been dedicated to address the factors associated with the crossover from homelessness to prison and vice versa (Metraux et al, 2007) based on small or non-representative samples (Herbert et al., 2015). Also, qualitative studies focused exclusively on subjective experiences have been criticized for not providing more robust and generalizable results (Richards, 2003; Balán & Jelín, 1979; cited in Ariovich & Raffo, 2010).

The purpose of this paper is two-fold. Firstly, introduces the main features of a mixed method approach, while the second aim of the paper seeks to present the strengths and weaknesses when combining quantitative and qualitative research methods within a longitudinal and multidimensional perspective regarding the association among crime, the criminal justice system, and homelessness. To conclude, some methodological implications will be discussed for social research on this issue.
Employment Relations in Small and Medium Enterprises: A Study on Selected Industrial Units in India through Mixed Research Methodology Approach

Abhishek Mishra, University of Burdwan - India

Introduction to the Research Agenda:

Employment relations (ER) in large organizations are managed by the human resource department. But the small and medium enterprises (SMEs) have no such mechanism to improve and maintain employee relations (Bacon and Storey, 2000). Thus, in the absence of any HRM department and HRM mechanism, there can be a decline in the power of employees. In this perspective, an interesting research problem would be to examine how ER is structured in the absence of HRM department in SMEs. This present research will, therefore, try to disentangle the current trends and distinctive aspects of employment relations in the SMEs in the selected industrial units in India and will examine the impact and implications of these trends and aspects on the employment relations scenario in the SME sector.

Objectives of the Research Work:

i) To understand the existing pattern of employment and operations of select industrial units in SMEs.

ii) To examine the extent to which the standardized employment relations practices exist in these industrial units on the basis of identified parameters of employment relations.

iii) To validate and improvise the existing Industrial Relations model developed by Dunlop vis-à-vis the ER trends and aspects in select SME sectors in India.

Research Methodology:

In terms of sample frame, some selected industrial units which are proprietary/entrepreneurial, local industrial agglomerate, and industries dispersed in nature and involving 20-100 employee/workers will be selected for the study. Mixed research forms an important research methodology approach in the realms of HRM. To achieve the objectives of the study, the dual approach of qualitative as well as quantitative approach will be pursued. Effort will be taken to extract data from primary and secondary data sources. In order to identify the trends and aspect in ER, data will be extracted from multiple secondary data/information sources comprising publications and reports of government, employers’ association, trade union etc. In this context, the researcher will carry out content analysis of the documents through which pertinent information would be obtained. Primary data would be obtained through questionnaire survey and interviews with important stakeholders with special focus on employees. Data triangulation and focus group techniques would be followed. For analysis of the responses to the questionnaire, non-parametric tests like Mann-Whitney and Kruswal-Wallis tests would be employed.
[Paper No 16]
Researching Walking Attitudes and Engagement: The Methodological Challenges of Studying the Health, Natural Environment, Physical Activity and Social Environment Related Aspects of Hillwalking

Nora Morocza, Liverpool John Moores University- UK

The physical health benefits of walking are well established in the Public Health literature and include better cardiovascular health (1), increased fitness and stamina (1-3), decreased body fat percentage (4), lower blood pressure (1, 4) and lowered cholesterol level (4). The mental health impacts are less frequently researched but lower depressions scores (4) and increased self-esteem (5) was reported by numerous studies. Only a few studies focused on the social aspects, and only in connection to mental well-being such as prevention from isolation and depression (1, 4, and 6).

Hillwalking as a nature based exercise has the scope to provide additional benefits which arise from the health and psychological advantages of exposure to nature. Studies found that physical activity in natural environments enhances the positive physical health related impacts (7, 8) and provides additional mental health benefits such as reduced anxiety (9), stress release (7, 9) and restorative experience (9, 10).

There is a gap in the literature in synthesising the health, environmental, physical activity related and social aspects of walking in natural environments. The present research project aims to gain understanding of the complexity of factors which might impact on motivation and long term engagement. The study will explore the physical activity related, environmental and psychological aspects of walking and walk-leading. The method will involve using a sample of walk-leaders who have extensive walking experience and knowledge about hillwalking, are engaged in regular outdoor physical activity and have in-depth understanding of the social aspects of walking through leading groups.

The proposed presentation will consider the methodological challenges of including interdisciplinary research questions. It will explore the rationale for using a mixed methods design consisting of novel walking interviews, physical activity measurements, location data and nature related questionnaires. The advantages and disadvantages of the complex study design will be discussed with respect to the research process including planning, data collection and presenting findings.

[Paper No 17]
The Impact of Indonesia’s LPG Conversion Program on Health Outcomes

Mook Bangalore, London School of Economics and Political Science - UK

Starting in 2005, the government of Indonesia embarked on a wide-scale program to convert 50 million households from kerosene to liquefied petroleum gas, which is a cleaner burning fuel. Due to the availability of LPG infrastructure, some areas of the country were treated before others.
Exploiting this differential treatment, this paper examines the impact of the scheme on two neighbouring villages - one which was treated and one which was not. Using a panel household survey, this paper uses a difference-in-difference analysis to assess the impact of the LPG conversion program on health outcomes for children.

[Paper No 18]

The Discourse of Legal Witnessing and Collective Memory: Lessons from the Archives of the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda.

Benjamin Thorne, University of Sussex - UK

This Paper will explain post-structuralism as the methodological approach of the research and will also address the theoretical elements in the researcher’s understanding of Foucauldian discourse analysis. There will be a discussion of the thesis’s use of methods as a set of analytical tools for analysing the data, which is taken from the archives of the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda (ICTR). The thesis attempts to address the problem of remembering the past and the discursive creation of the witness by posing the research question: ‘How should witnesses of human rights violations contribute to collective memory in transitional post-conflict societies?’ The research methodology and method discussed in this paper will position the research within a post-structuralist approach to discourse analysis. Specifically, it draws on the strategies for understanding discourse conceived by Michel Foucault as a mode for assessing discursive formations of objects, statements and subjects within a discourse of witnessing at the ICTR.

The archives of the ICTR (1994-2015), are commonly perceived by the tribunal and the legal scholarship on transitional justice as providing a historical legal record of the facts of mass human rights violations. However, whilst the legal scholarship on transitional justice commonly advocates the importance of legal archives during transitional periods. There has been minimal direct engagement by the transitional justice scholarship with legal archives. Importantly this research understands legal archives as a site where the discursive formation and conditions that constitute a discourse of witnessing can be explored. For the first time, this research suggests the archive documents at the ICTR to be understood as entailing the discursive conditions upon which law produces an authoritative singular account of a violent past. The ICTR archives are not analysed here in order to determine whether the legal process has allowed witnesses to remember. Rather, understanding the restricted space of the discursive field and the set of conditions that forms it allows both memory and witness subject(s) to be understood as being discursively constituted. Thus it is by applying a Foucauldian discourse analysis that the ICTR archives are a crucial site, which can offer an alternative understanding on the scope and limitations in which international tribunals and courts can contribute to truth telling during periods of transition.
A Tale of Two Paradigms: The Best of the Times for Quantitative and Qualitative Research

Gülçin Gülmez Dağ, Middle East Technical University - Turkey

It was the epoch of numbers, it was the epoch of narration; it then was the ex-ante epoch of the clash of two research method titans. The foci of quantitative research methodology found its roots in the positivist philosophy with the core revolving around canons as valid measurement, scientific verification, mathematical proof and generalization of the observable. Qualitative research, as an offspring of the post-positivist paradigm, on the other end underscored the discovery of multiple realities, in-depth exploration and maximum understanding of the pedantically obtained nuances from purposefully selected key informants rather than randomly sampled individuals. The incontestable fact is that both streams of research long flowed in the comfort zone of their philosophically-accommodated waterbeds. Each then tried to refute the modus operandi of the other methodology; and the kernels that would enrich the soil of research fell down through the cracks created by the very clash of the titans. Yet the potential merit of each line brings sadly been and is still being overlooked.

To illustrate, having set out my individual journey with a strong inclination towards one of the two cities, the qualitative methodology, my thereafter theory- and praxis-based research experiences (the art and the craft of research) had me inquire more into, frequently revisit and take transit passes in-between the two paradigms. At the seventh anniversary of my first acquaintance with and extensive engagement in research utilizing both qualitative and qualitative methodologies, my final standpoint in this clash is to separately appreciate the value of both. I realized that the best and the worst of the times for a research methodology depended on tailoring the methods to address research question in the most appropriate manner.

In this vein, the purpose of this paper is threefold: (1) to share personal scientific experiences with different research methodologies, (2) to gain more insight into research through the art and craft repertoire of fellow researchers, and, (3) to exchange ideas, establish network, and collaborate with colleagues from diverse backgrounds in an international and academic setting. To achieve these ends, research studies I conducted using either of the methodologies and several other research questions will be shared with the audience to prompt discussion and critically examine other ways of looking at research methods. Lastly, opportunities and challenges brought by different approaches to research will interactively be discussed.
My research suggests that there exists an alternative form of international political behaviour between countries who share a common traumatic past: diplomacy with history. Diplomacy with history manifests itself as an official, diplomatic team performance that aims at conveying a certain historic image for the purpose of achieving rational aims on the international stage.

Empirically investigating the diplomacy with history combines IR approaches with historical/archival research methods. Researching whether or not state actors employ a specific history or official national narrative as a strategy to pursue their aims at the international stage requires qualitative analysis of diplomatic negotiations and debates including foreign policy directives, decisions and documents, private and public rhetoric as well as symbolic and substantive gestures of diplomats and foreign policy-makers. Hereby, the reasoning behind a particular course of action, as well as the actual discourse used and the symbolic gestures made towards the target state should convey that a specific strategy of diplomacy with history is consistently employed and that substantive action is chosen accordingly even if that implies incurring significant costs. In fact, it is the often costly effort of projecting a specific national narrative on the diplomatic stage that makes diplomacy with history run counter to the material cost-benefit calculations that dictate international behaviour in mainstream IR theory. This research therefore places itself – both subject-wise and methodologically – at the intersection between International Relations and Contemporary History.

NB: Photographs and/or video will be taken at today’s event. By taking part in this conference you grant the event organiser’s full rights to use the images for publicity, archival or other purposes. If you do not wish to be photographed please inform an event organiser.
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