

8-5-2018

Using Expert Interviews within MODES in Online and Offline Spaces to Extend Comprehensive Literature Review Processes

Alana Morris

Sam Houston State University, afm008@shsu.edu


Anthony J. Onwuegbuzie

Sam Houston State University, tonyonwuegbuzie@aol.com

Hannah R. Gerber

Sam Houston State University, hrg004@shsu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr>

 Part of the [Education Commons](#), [Quantitative, Qualitative, Comparative, and Historical Methodologies Commons](#), and the [Social Statistics Commons](#)

Recommended APA Citation

Morris, A., Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Gerber, H. R. (2018). Using Expert Interviews within MODES in Online and Offline Spaces to Extend Comprehensive Literature Review Processes. *The Qualitative Report*, 23(8), 1777-1798. Retrieved from <https://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol23/iss8/1>

This How To Article is brought to you for free and open access by the The Qualitative Report at NSUWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in The Qualitative Report by an authorized administrator of NSUWorks. For more information, please contact nsuworks@nova.edu.



Using Expert Interviews within MODES in Online and Offline Spaces to Extend Comprehensive Literature Review Processes

Abstract

In this article, we explore a 7-step process for conducting a comprehensive literature review (CLR). Specifically, after describing each of the steps, we explain the importance of expanding the search beyond traditional databases through 5 multimodal tasks that Onwuegbuzie and Frels (2016) refer to as MODES (Media, Observations, Documents, Experts, and Secondary Data), which can be undertaken separately, or which may interact with each other. Then, we highlight and provide an exemplar process for the Experts task, which motivates researchers to identify, to seek out, and to interview 1 or more experts associated with their research question(s). Furthermore, we illustrate the value of conducting the formal or informal expert interviews within online and offline spaces, not only because they provide rich and the most up-to-date information that can be used to inform, to guide, and to expand the CLR process, but also that they can generate relevant information that represent one or more of the other MODES.

Keywords

Comprehensive Literature Review, Multimodal, MODES, Experts, Online and Offline Spaces, Offline-Based Interviews, Online-Based Interviews, Methodology of Story-Sharing

Creative Commons License



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-Share Alike 4.0 License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/).

Using Expert Interviews within MODES in Online and Offline Spaces to Extend Comprehensive Literature Review Processes

Alana Morris

Sam Houston State University, Huntsville, Texas, USA

Anthony J. Onwuegbuzie

Sam Houston State University, Huntsville, Texas, USA
University of Johannesburg, South Africa

Hannah R. Gerber

Sam Houston State University, Huntsville, Texas USA

In this article, we explore a 7-step process for conducting a comprehensive literature review (CLR). Specifically, after describing each of the steps, we explain the importance of expanding the search beyond traditional databases through 5 multimodal tasks that Onwuegbuzie and Frels (2016) refer to as MODES (Media, Observations, Documents, Experts, and Secondary Data), which can be undertaken separately, or which may interact with each other. Then, we highlight and provide an exemplar process for the Experts task, which motivates researchers to identify, to seek out, and to interview 1 or more experts associated with their research question(s). Furthermore, we illustrate the value of conducting the formal or informal expert interviews within online and offline spaces, not only because they provide rich and the most up-to-date information that can be used to inform, to guide, and to expand the CLR process, but also that they can generate relevant information that represent one or more of the other MODES. Keywords: Comprehensive Literature Review, Multimodal, MODES, Experts, Online and Offline Spaces, Offline-Based Interviews, Online-Based Interviews, Methodology of Story-Sharing

The importance of the extant literature review in qualitative, quantitative, and mixed research studies cannot be overstated (Boote & Beile, 2005; Combs, Bustamante, & Onwuegbuzie, 2010; Onwuegbuzie, Collins, Leech, Dellinger, & Jiao, 2010; Onwuegbuzie & Frels, 2016). Onwuegbuzie and Frels (2016)—in what recently has been labelled as a “landmark book” (Williams, 2018, p. 345)—categorized these reasons into the following three major areas: topic-driven focused, connection-driven focused, and method-driven focused. Topic-driven focused reasons are subdivided further into reasons related to informing the underlying topic, narrowing the topic, and providing a new lens to the topic. Connection-driven focused reasons are subdivided further into reasons related to making interconnections with the topic and making outerconnections with the topic. Finally, method-driven focused reasons represent reasons related to exploring new methods. Onwuegbuzie and Frels’s (2016) typology of reasons is presented in Table 1.

Table 1 – A Typology of Reasons for Conducting a Literature Review

Meta-Reason	Reason	Examples	
Topic-driven focused			
	To Inform the Topic	Rationalize the significance of a topic	
		Avoid unintentional and unnecessary replication	
		Identify key research on a topic, sources, and authors	
		Identify the structure of a component in a topic	
		Define and limit the research problem	
		Identify key landmark studies, sources, and authors	
	To Narrow the Topic	Give focus to a topic	
		Acquire and enhance language associated with a topic	
	To Provide a New Lens to the Topic	Synthesize and gain a new perspective on a topic	
		Distinguish exemplary research	
		Establish context for author's own interest	
	Connection focused		
	To Make Interconnections with the Topic	Identify relationships between theory/concepts and practice	
		Identify contradictions and inconsistencies	
		Identify relationships between ideas and practice	
		Identify strengths and weaknesses of the various research approaches that have been utilized	
	To Make Outer connections with the Topic	Distinguish what has been researched and what needs to be researched	
		Evaluate the context of a topic or problem	
		Bridge the identified gaps on a topic	
		Place the research in a historical context	
		Provide rationale for research hypotheses	
		Form basis for justifying significance of target study	
		Identify the scope of the author's investigation	
		Provide avenues for future research	
	Facilitate interpretation of study results		
	Method-driven focused		
		To Explore New Methods	Identify philosophical stances and assumptions used by the authors
Identify the theoretical, conceptual, and/or practical frameworks used by the authors			
Identify the procedures (e.g., sample size, research design, data collection instruments, and/or data analysis techniques) used by authors			

In fact, Onwuegbuzie, Leech, and Collins (2012) suggest that conducting a literature review in an optimal manner (i.e., with comprehensiveness and rigor) is equivalent to conducting a complete research study—specifically, a mixed research study. Consistent with this assertion here, Onwuegbuzie et al. (2010) mapped the 13 steps of the mixed research process—as conceptualized by Collins, Onwuegbuzie, and Sutton (2006)—onto the literature review process, leading to their framework wherein the literature review process represents a study that contains 13 steps. Much like the *Mouse Trap* play brilliantly woven as a parallel subplot

within Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, an effective literature review that adds value and depth to a research question (cf. Table 1) is intricately layered as a study within the larger study in a recursive rather than a linear design. Onwuegbuzie and Frels (2016) assert that a comprehensive literature review (CLR) is a methodology and requires the same attention to sampling, reflection, evaluation, analysis, synthesis, and, ultimately, responsibility in reporting the data. Within this methodology, qualitative research approaches play a vital role in the CLR process. Indeed, as identified by Onwuegbuzie and Frels (2016, p. 50), virtually every research article that informs a CLR contains qualitative information that optimally necessitate the use of qualitative approaches, such as the following:

- findings pertaining to each qualitative study presented in the literature review section of the source
- the literature review section of each quantitative, qualitative, or mixed research study presented in the literature review section of the source
- information about the sample characteristics pertaining to each quantitative, qualitative, or mixed research study presented in the literature review section of the source
- conclusion section of each quantitative, qualitative, or mixed research study presented in the literature review section of the source; and findings in the results section of each qualitative study presented in the literature review section

In an analysis of articles submitted to the journal *Research in the Schools*, the editors noted that 40% of the submitted articles over a 2-year span contained inadequate literature reviews (Onwuegbuzie & Daniel, 2005). Inadequate literature reviews are “underdeveloped, contain a disproportionate amount of dated citations, do not include the most classic or influential citations, contain statements which represent findings that are not supported by citations, and do not include a clear theoretical/conceptual framework” (Onwuegbuzie & Daniel, 2005, p. 4). In an earlier study, Alton-Lee (1998) noted a similar pattern, with 50% of the articles submitted over a 1-year period having literature reviews that were not adequate, partially defined as “failure by authors to critically interrogate the literature” (p. 889). Highlighting potential root causes of the incessant problem, Onwuegbuzie and Frels (2016) detail 10 myths that linger in both theory and practice when constructing the literature review. They categorize the myths into three elements: scope, sequence, and identity. The most prevalent myth is the idea that the literature review contains only print and digital versions of literature that currently exists. Indeed, with the widespread availability of Web 2.0 technology, information that informs a literature review does not have to represent only literature. This Web 2.0 technology allows literature reviewers access to databases (i.e., containing qualitative and/or quantitative data), images (i.e., still or moving), guidebooks, maps, and other tools (Onwuegbuzie & Frels, 2016). Thus, by conducting a *traditional* literature review, wherein only literature is extracted, qualitative researchers, quantitative researchers, and mixed researchers alike cannot possibly conduct a *comprehensive* literature review because they would not be omitting the extraction of relevant Web 2.0-based information. It is this pervasive myth, one of identity, that is the focus of our article as we present a method and an exemplar process that offers a concrete, systematic method for ensuring that novice and experienced researchers craft a CLR that functions as what Boote and Beile (2005) define as “the foundation and inspiration for substantial, useful research” (p. 3).

Conceptual Framework

According to Pirolli and Card (1999), “Humans actively seek, gather, share, and consume information to a degree unapproached by other organisms” (p. 643). In fact, Miller (1983) suggests that humans are instinctively “*informavores*.” Since this seminal connection between biological foraging and foraging for information, the metaphor has been repeated and extended for a variety of purposes (Dennett, 1991; Nielsen & Loranger, 2006). For example, Nielsen and Loranger (2006) highlight the “information scent” within online spaces by explaining, “*Informavores* will keep clicking as long as they sense that they’re ‘getting warmer’—the scent must keep getting stronger or they will give up” (p. 52). It is this complex understanding of how we hunger for valuable information as consumers and producers of research in “both online and offline spaces” (Gerber, Abrams, Curwood, & Magnifico, 2017, p. 7) that molds the concept of conducting educational research (i.e., the systematic collection, analysis, and interpretation of data related to the field of education; Yates, 2004) in a contemporary era. Rigorous educational research can be transferred from offline into online spaces, but only through careful cultivation, and a thorough conceptualization, of what matters as educational research in the digital era. In fact, as Gerber et al. (2017) posited, “such an approach [contemporary educational research in online spaces] accounts for multi-sited, hyperlinked, and hypermobile practices that are otherwise difficult to trace, document, and analyze with traditional and singular methodologies. Increased flexibility and reflexivity are essential” (p. 169). This claim underscores the importance of Onwuegbuzie and Frels’s (2016) five MODES for extending “ethical” and “culturally” progressive research approaches (p. 39). The modes comprise **Media**: Using audio and video tools; **Observations**: Extending the function of qualitative observations to include examples that help strengthen understanding regarding the topic, concepts, and/or the research questions; **Documents**: Exploring special issues of journals, dissertations and theses, monographs, conference papers, and so forth; **Experts**: seeking out experts in the field of interest; and **Secondary Data**: Extending the search by analyzing and including results from secondary sources such as completed surveys, censuses, and records (pp. 178-211). The five search extensions, which Onwuegbuzie and Frels (2016) recommend that all literature reviewers undertake to the greatest extent possible, allow for *inclusion* rather than *exclusion* of valuable information and resources.

Broadly speaking, *Media*, the first component of MODES, involves the identification, location, and extraction of visual representations that are either in still form (e.g., photographs, drawings/paintings) or moving form (e.g., videos); either involving 2-dimensional (e.g., drawings, paintings) or multidimensional (e.g., movies) images; and can be either non-virtual (e.g., drawings) or virtual (e.g., I-phone, I-Pad, Youtube, Panoramio, Flickr, iMovie, Instagram) images (Onwuegbuzie & Frels, 2016). Visual representations produced within online spaces via Web 2.0 tools (e.g., YouTube, Flickr, Panoramio, iMovie iTunes, Snapchat) are particularly useful here (Onwuegbuzie & Frels, 2016).

Observations, the second component of MODES, involves the researcher observing the phenomenon of interest so that the findings from the extant literature can be contextualized geographically. These observations can be obtained either first hand (i.e., by the researcher)—which is optimal—or second hand (i.e., by someone else); can be obtained interactively (i.e., via live observations) or non-interactively (i.e., via past observations); and can involve emic-based (i.e., insider perspective; e.g., onsite observations) or etic-based (i.e., outsider perspective; e.g., Geographic Information Systems [GIS] information collection. For example, as described by Onwuegbuzie and Frels (2016), a literature reviewer can examine empirical research articles that have been published on the topic of effective schools and visit the location of one or more of these schools that have been identified in these articles and, once there, observe the sociocultural aspects of these schools (e.g., location, size, socioeconomic status,

levels of crime) and collect media data (e.g., digital photographs) that can be integrated with the extant literature. Alternatively, the literature reviewer can map the regions where each identified effective school resides in order to contextualize graphically the findings from the extant literature.

Documents, the third component of MODES, takes the form of printed text (e.g., books, theses, dissertations, monographs, encyclopedias, Internet websites, government documents, popular magazines, trade catalogues, interview transcripts, company reports, congressional/parliamentary bills, and advertisements) and digital text (e.g., Facebook, Myspace.com, Ning, Second Life, Bebo, Friendster, Orkut, WhatsApp). Whereas using printed text to inform literature reviews has a long history—being traced back approximately 350 years, starting with the publication of the first academic journal in the English language on March 6, 1665 called the *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society*—the use of digital text has a much shorter history that is continually evolving, opening up increasingly new affinity spaces where knowledge is co-constructed (Gerber et al., 2017).

Experts, the fourth component of MODES, involves interviewing or talking directly—either formally or informally—with one or more of the leading and/or prolific authors that the literature reviewer has identified at some point during her/his literature review. These interviews/talks can be individually (e.g., interviews) or group-based (e.g., focus groups); can occur synchronously (e.g., face-to-face, phone call, Short Message Service [SMS] via mobile telephones) or asynchronously (e.g., via email, blogs); can involve the collection of verbal (i.e., voice of each interviewee) and/or nonverbal (e.g., proxemics, kinesics, paralinguistics, chronemic) data; and can occur within offline spaces (e.g., face-to-face, phone call) or online spaces (e.g., via online meeting, desktop sharing, and video conferencing software such as Skype, GoToMeeting; online focus groups; chatroom discussions; listservs). Because interviewing leading and/or prolific authors involves the collection of (qualitative) data, a literature reviewer should seek ethics approval to do so from their institution's Institutional Review Board (IRB). And because the literature review process represents a study within a larger (primary) study, the ethics step of the CLR could be documented as part of the application for Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval for the overall primary research study. As such, these expert interviews would be IRB-approved or, at least, IRB-cleared (e.g., receiving notification from the IRB that the expert interviews fall under the umbrella of oral history and thus do not need IRB approval), thereby increasing the ethicalness of these interviews.

Secondary data, the fifth and final component of MODES, represent information that is collected by someone other than the literature reviewer or some group (e.g., educational institutions, accreditation agencies). Such information includes data collected via surveys, censuses, and records. As described by Onwuegbuzie and Frels (2016), an important benefit of the use of secondary data is that it would be more efficient to utilize trustworthy data that have already been collected by someone else. Further, the literature reviewer can select data that have a pre-established degree of validity/legitimation, reliability/dependability, and authenticity. Also, these secondary data can serve as baseline data that literature reviewers use to compare to primary data that arise from their own studies. As an example of how secondary data can be incorporated into the CLR report, the literature reviewer can use these data to obtain the most current information (e.g., prevalence rates) that are included in the CLR report, bearing in mind that there is always a time lag between when the findings emerged for the researcher(s) and when the works in which they are delineated (e.g., research article) are published and made available to literature reviewers.

Purpose

Of these five MODES, extending the CLR through the intentional search for (foraging for) experts and/or expert researchers in the area of interest provides a powerful layer of depth for potential historical perspectives. Additionally, seeking out experts (e.g., leading and/or prolific authors) provides a process to ensure inclusion of the most up-to-date trends and research in the field. An added value is that the expert might be willing to share current work, including unpublished research studies. Moreover, as discussed by Onwuegbuzie and Frels (2016), use of expert interviews often enhances one or more of the other four MODES. For instance, in the experience of the second author, it is quite common for experts to bring to the attention of the literature reviewer their works or the works of other (key) authors that represent Media (e.g., videos), Observations (i.e., GIS data), Documents (e.g., blogs, twitter posts), and/or Secondary data (e.g., data collected by the expert).

The notion of including the voices of experts in this co-constructed transaction of meaning among the extant literature, the researcher(s), and the reviewer (Rosenblatt, 1978) is relatively new with few or no exemplars of the explicit process. Yet, in order to motivate literature reviewers to consider identifying, seeking out, and interviewing experts to inform their literature review process, such exemplars are needed. Thus, the purpose of this article is to discuss the rationale, to chronicle the required steps, and to provide specific examples that will motivate researchers to shift their literature reviews from a static, one-dimensional product (i.e., stemming only from the extant literature) to an integrated, multilayered process that extends representation and legitimation, through relying on contemporary approaches that hinge on the researcher navigating offline and online spaces in order to conduct one's CLR. We hope that this article would provide a compelling exemplar process for the Experts task of MODES but also would illustrate the value of literature reviewers conducting formal or informal interviews of experts within online and offline spaces.

This article involved the collaboration of the following three co-authors: Anthony J. (Tony) Onwuegbuzie, Hannah R. Gerber, and Alana Morris (lead author). Tony Onwuegbuzie is Professor in the Department of Educational Leadership at Sam Houston State University, where he teaches doctoral-level courses in qualitative research, quantitative research, and mixed research, including program evaluation. Further, he is a Distinguished Visiting Professor at the University of Johannesburg. As immediate Past President of the Mixed Methods International Research Association (MMIRA), and as someone who is passionate about qualitative research, quantitative research, and mixed research, Tony co-authored the SAGE mixed research textbook with Rebecca Frels (Lamar University), entitled, *Seven Steps to a Comprehensive Literature Review: A Multimodal and Cultural Approach*, in which they conceptualized the notion of MODES that motivated the current article. Hannah R. Gerber is an Associate Professor of Literacy at Sam Houston State University. Hannah teaches graduate and doctoral classes in qualitative methods, digital ethnography, and digital literacies. She has published extensively on the connection between video games and adolescent literacy in top peer-reviewed journals, has co-authored and co-edited multiple books, including co-authoring the SAGE book, *Conducting Qualitative Research of Learning in Online Spaces*, and has served as an invited keynote speaker at numerous national and international literacy, technology, and learning conferences. Hannah and Tony have co-authored a few published works (e.g., article, book chapter) and currently are co-authoring a book, alongside Tom Liam Lynch (Pace University), in the area of mixed and multimethod approaches to using big data. Additionally, as President of the International Council for Educational Media (ICEM), it is perhaps not surprising that she embraced the concept of using MODES to extend ethical and culturally progressive CLR approaches. Interestingly, Hannah made the decision to design a whole course based on Tony's and Rebecca's CLR book, which she has now taught on three

occasions. Enter Alana Morris, the lead author of the current article. Alana is a doctoral candidate in the Literacy Program at Sam Houston State University and the Director of Personalized Professional Learning in Spring Branch Independent School District in Houston, Texas. Alana's cohort was the first to take Hannah's CLR course. Alana was inspired by the notion of MODES in general and the Experts task in particular, and, as she describes in the following sections, decided to undergo the Experts task as part of the CLR for her dissertation. And after an extremely positive experience engaging with the Experts task, she knew it was her academic and ethical responsibility to share her experiences, as we do for the remainder of this article.

Heuristic Exemplars Involving the Lead Author

Method

Although research trends from the literacy field focus on either reading habits or writing habits and implications (e.g., Applegate & Applegate, 2004; Hale, 2011; Langer, 2000), prominent literacy practitioner researchers advocate that teachers of reading and writing must understand the complexities of consuming, analyzing, and producing texts (e.g., Almasi, O'Flahavan, & Arya, 2001; see also Applebee & Langer, 2013; Atwell, 1987; Carroll & Wilson, 2008; Laminack & Wadsworth, 2015; Newkirk, 2014; Rosenblatt, 1994). The objective of my (Alana, the lead author's) research study and the prominent focus of my comprehensive review of the extant literature is to explore the reciprocity between writing and reading and how intentional instruction in writing and the production of language might lead to improved reading comprehension and improved ability to analyze complex texts. The goal is to add to the body of literature regarding the impact of explicit writing instruction on reading processes and comprehension, especially at secondary grade levels, and for this study, specifically eighth-grade students in a large urban school district in the southwest region of the United States.

Having already utilized some of the MODES within the literature search, the idea of interviewing experts piqued my (i.e., the lead author's) curiosity. Conducting interviews is the most widely used type of data collection in qualitative research (Creswell, 2007). And such expert interview data now collected as part of the CLR process could potentially provide a layer of richness that is not possible through traditional methods of searching through published studies.

In order to abide by ethical compliance, we queried the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at the university where the study took place as to whether the nature of this project warranted the submission of an IRB protocol. The IRB compliance officer deemed that this type of interview process falls within the realm of oral histories rather than research. Federal regulations under the Department of Health and Human Services, Office for Human Research Protections Code of Federal Regulations, Title 45, Part 46, Section 102d (45 CFR 46.102d) state that research is "a systematic investigation, including research development, testing and evaluation, designed to develop or contribute to generalizable knowledge." As such, none of the interviews for this project required us to submit an exempt IRB protocol.

In Step 3 of the CLR process, namely, *Storing and Organizing Information*, Onwuegbuzie and Frels (2016) recommend that literature reviewers store and organize the relevant information that they have extracted. Accordingly, such information can be stored and organized at three different levels of complexity: basic, intermediate, or advanced strategies. Basic strategies range from the use of index cards to word processors (e.g., Microsoft Word). Intermediate strategies include spreadsheets (e.g., Microsoft Excel), web-based applications (e.g., Google Docs, Google Sheets, Dropbox), and Internet-based social bookmarking services

(e.g., ResearchGate; <http://www.researchgate.net/>). Finally, advanced strategies range from reference management software programs (e.g., EndNote; <http://endnote.com/>) to computer-assisted qualitative data analysis software programs (e.g., NVivo; http://www.qsrinternational.com/products_nvivo.aspx) and computer-assisted mixed methods data analysis software programs (e.g., QDA Miner; <https://provalisresearch.com/>). According to Onwuegbuzie and Frels (2016), whatever system is used to store and to organize information, literature reviewers should create a summary table that summarize each set of information extracted. For example, a summary table can be created via a Microsoft Excel file, which, subsequently, allows reviewers electronically to edit, to format (e.g., change font and font size; bold or italicize text), to check spellings, to utilize a built-in thesaurus, to copy and to paste multiple text and graphics from other programs (e.g., Microsoft Word, pdf files, HTML documents, webpages) to the Microsoft Excel file, to print, and to save. Summary information that appears in summary tables may include the name of the author, the year/date of publication, the source, the genre of the information (e.g., empirical article, non-empirical work), type of methodology (e.g., qualitative, quantitative, mixed research), summary of the work/findings/assumptions/ideas/beliefs/propositions/theories/schemas/models/hypotheses/or the like, and reference (e.g., using American Psychological Association style guide) for the reference list pertaining to the literature review report.

A leading researcher in my (the lead author's) area of interest, who appeared numerous times in my summary table of the literature and whose articles were selected for inclusion within my review of the extant literature, was Dr. Steve Graham at Arizona State University. My summary table of literature was utilized to archive, to categorize, and to organize essential details from the hundreds of sources harvested during the search process, including the author(s), the title, the publication year, a summary of the article, the type of methodology, the complete American Psychological Association (APA) reference citation, and the rationale for selecting or deselecting the article. Because of the quality and quantity of his publications in my area of interest, as well as the number of times that he had been cited, Dr. Steve Graham indubitably could be deemed to be an expert. After emailing Dr. Graham and explaining my interests, we set up an interview time via Skype. I initially proposed numerous options for the interview environment, including my traveling to Arizona for a meeting in an offline space via face-to-face or a phone conversation or a meeting in an online space via Skype, Google Hangout, or GoToMeeting. Dr. Graham was in Australia at the time and recommended that we set up an expert interview via a Skype call upon his return the following month. This interview environment, although not face-to-face, provided several benefits. Skype, owned by Microsoft and initially released in 2003 (Bright, 2011), did not take long to emerge as an important online alternative to face-to-face and telephone interviews, providing synchronous interaction between the researcher and the participant(s). Bertrand and Bourdeau (2010) conducted one of the first research studies to compare Skype-to-Skype to face-to-face interview environments. Since that time, researchers have conducted additional studies, emphasizing important benefits, including safety of lone interviewers with strangers, environmental benefits due to alleviated travel, flexibility in scheduling times, protecting privacy of space, and the capability of still capturing both verbal and nonverbal cues (Bertrand & Bourdeau, 2010; Deakin & Wakefield, 2014; Hanna, 2012; Janghorban, Roudsari, & Taghipour, 2014; Oates, 2015; Shapka, Domene, Khan, & Yang, 2016). Without the flexibility provided through this online interview environment, it likely would not have been possible to find a time that worked with our schedules.

The expert interview data were collected via what Roulston (2010) refers to as a constructionist approach, which allowed a two-way, co-constructed path toward deeper understanding and relevant connections to Dr. Graham's findings related to my research questions (cf. Table 2). According to Roulston (2010), the constructionist conception of

interviewing is based on the theoretical assumption that knowledge is co-constructed by both the interviewer and interviewee “to generate situated meanings and possible ways of talking about research topics” (Roulston, 2010, p. 218). Prior to the expert interview, I constructed broad questions connected to Dr. Graham’s work with literacy because I wanted to be able to connect and to compare his ideas and research to my overarching questions. These broad questions essentially involved a form of co-construction that stemmed from the interaction between me and the previously published text created by Dr. Graham. Janesick (2016) describes these types of interview questions as “big-picture questions, follow-up questions, and comparison questions” (p. 101). I constructed four open-ended interview questions, congruent with Janesick’s descriptions, as follows: (a) How did your daughter’s interest in videogames spark her interest to get better with writing and your interest in writing research? (b) How have research questions changed in the last few years that might be a direct connection to the national push for literary analysis and close reading? (c) If you were to design a current experimental or quasi-experimental study that would add value to the field, what would you do? and (d) On what literacy projects are you currently working?

Table 2 – *Dissertation Research Questions of Lead Author (Alana)*

Type of Question	Question
Quantitative Research Questions	What is the relationship between Grade 8 literacy teachers’ implementation of five district literacy initiatives and students’ reading achievement?
	What is the relationship between Grade 8 literacy teachers’ implementation of five district literacy initiatives and students’ application of specific literacy constructs in their expository essays?
	What is the relationship between teachers’ implementation of five district literacy initiatives and students’ ability to analyze their own writing for specific literacy constructs in their expository essays?
	What is the relationship between teachers’ years of experience and their level of implementation of five district literacy initiatives?
	What is the relationship between teachers’ certification type of their level of implementation of five district literacy initiatives?
Qualitative Research Questions	What are teachers’ perceptions of district-level support regarding five literacy initiatives?
	What are teachers’ perceptions of campus-level support regarding five literacy initiatives?
	What are teachers’ perceptions of their capacity to implement five district literacy initiatives?
	What are teachers’ perceptions of students’ literacy capacity?
Mixed Methods Research Questions	How are teachers’ perceptions of campus and district support congruent with their degree of implementation of five district literacy initiatives?
	How are teachers’ perceptions of their capacity to implement five district literacy initiatives congruent with their students’ Grade 8 reading achievement?

Prior to the slated time for our Skype call, Dr. Graham and I shared our Skype account details and I accounted for the time difference between Arizona and Texas to ensure accuracy in timing the Skype connection. Although the interview time was immediately after work hours (5:00 pm CST), I ensured privacy in my office by alerting my department members that I would be on a phone conference and placing a note on my office door. Also, I set my cell phone to airplane mode to avoid receiving any phone calls or text messages because I had planned to use the voice recorder as an additional backup. I audio- and video-recorded the Skype interview

using Camtasia (Matuschak, 2006), which allowed me to *see* rather than simply to hear the spikes in intonation and to capture the time elapsed during pauses in speech with measured accuracy. Utilizing and screen recording the Skype call allowed me to capture body movements, which provided an additional layer of information (Denham & Onwuegbuzie, 2013) congruent with face-to-face interviews. In addition, I used a Sony IC handheld recorder and my cell phone voice recorder in case there were any technology glitches with Skype or Camtasia.

Dr. Graham participated in the interview on the back porch of his home. Although there was ambient noise, nothing interrupted the flow of the interview. Because he was outdoors in August, however, the temperature in Arizona was a topic of discussion and might have caused discomfort because it was 110 degrees on the day of the Skype call. After transcribing the 60-minute expert interview, I sent it to Dr. Graham for member checking (Miles, Huberman, & Saldaña, 2014) to provide him with an opportunity to add, to delete, or to change any of his ideas in order to ensure accuracy, adequacy, and authenticity. According to Manning (1997), a complete member checking that involves a review of the researcher's field notes, hunches, and the like implies that the researcher is accountable to her/his interviewees, who reveal their stories. Whereas ensuring accuracy and adequacy maximized descriptive validity (i.e., the factual accuracy of the account as documented by me as the researcher; cf. Maxwell, 1992), ensuring authenticity enhanced interpretive validity (i.e., the extent to which my interpretation of Dr. Graham's account represented an understanding of his perspective and the meanings attached to his words and actions; Maxwell, 1992). Further, according to Cho and Trent (2006), transactional validity represents an interactive process among the researcher, the participants, and the ensuing data, with the goal being to enhance the level of accuracy and consensus via the re-examination of the data (e.g., experiences, perceptions) that have been collected and interpreted. In contrast, transformative validity is a process that is both progressive and emancipatory, and which motivates social change via the research enterprise itself (Cho & Trent, 2006). Thus, a worthy goal of my member checking was to establish both transactional validity and transformative validity. Dr. Graham did not suggest any changes to the transcribed interview but did comment that we spoke a long time, which was evident from the length of the transcript. Due to the nature of this article and the importance of establishing Dr. Graham as an expert (e.g., Mary Emily Warner Professor in the Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College at Arizona State University; author of several books and more than 135 articles typically in the area of developing writers and students with special needs in both elementary and secondary schools; author of three influential Carnegie Corporation reports on writing) and disclosing identifying details of his work, he gave me written permission to use his actual name rather than a pseudonym.

Reading the transcript provided me with a unique transaction with the new text on the page—the two voices juxtaposed together in print. The interview shifted unintentionally from a semi-structured interview with a formal tone into an academic conversation regarding writing and literacy in general as if we were sitting at a coffee shop pondering current trends on literacy and literacy research, which, again, emphasized the constructionist nature and lens of the interview. Alternatively stated, using the framework of Roulston (2010), the expert interview shifted from a *constructionist conception* (as described earlier), wherein I was not able to access Dr. Graham's authentic self, to a *romantic conception* of the interview. In the context of my expert interview, a romantic conception yielded the type of conversation between Dr. Graham and me that was both intimate and self-revealing and that assisted me in establishing rapport and empathic connection with him, which, in turn, allowed us both to play an active role during the interview process (Roulston, 2010). Consistent with the major theoretical assumption of the romantic conception, through the development of rapport, I was able to obtain shared meaning regarding Dr. Graham's experiences and perspectives about the research topic.

Moreover, I was able to access his authentic (i.e., inner) self. The questions that were constructed a priori served as a nudge into conversation, leading to thoughts and topics that I could not have predicted in advance. This cognitive, academic stroll with an expert in the field of literacy research not only added richness to my understanding of his research design, methodology, and findings, but also added insight into how my study would extend his work and add value to the field. For example, an unexpected residual benefit that stemmed from interviewing Dr. Graham was feedback and probing questions regarding my study from someone who understood the complex nuances of my research questions—providing even more potential authenticity, relevance, and immediacy to my study.

Benefits of Co-Constructing Meaning with Experts

The interview with Dr. Graham brought his voice to life and allowed me to understand his research, his concepts, and his processes in ways not possible from printed texts alone. As such, this additional layer of information added depth to my CLR. In addition, a recent presentation that he emailed and a forthcoming study that he promised to send will ensure inclusion of the most current information. The recency of this information, in turn, will circumvent what Onwuegbuzie and Frels (2016) bemoaned as the time lag between when the idea is first conceptualized/written and when it becomes accessible [e.g., by being published]—referred to as the *emergence-to-publication time lag* (p. 205), which typically represents at least 1 year and could represent 3 or more years, “which is a long-enough time in some fields for a whole paradigm shift to have occurred” (p. 205). The greatest energy that I have experienced in my research thus far as a doctoral student came during the 60 minutes when I was engaged in this intense and meaningful conversation with a leading researcher—an academic collaborator!

When asked about his daughter’s struggles with writing that led to the topic of motivation, Dr. Graham provided extended ideas,

I think there's a skill-level and a motivational-level that are important. I also think that to progress as writers, there's a lot of different kinds of knowledge that one needs to acquire. You need to have something to write about, knowledge of your topic, you need to know about the genre that you're working in, and the basic structures and constructions that are common there. You obviously have to have quite a bit of knowledge about vocabulary if you're going to construct sentences that convey your intended meaning. Then, your strategic prowess is another. Your ability to approach writing as a problem. Through planning, monitoring, evaluation and revising and goal setting, to construct the product that you most want for the audience that you most want. I think motivation is an important part of this, but I think writing development over time and especially moving beyond competence depends on all four of those factors.

His thoughts regarding what is needed for writers at the skill and motivational levels speaks to the importance of teacher training and skill sets regarding these instructional processes and factors. My study is dependent upon teachers having the capacity to implement integrated reading and writing processes. When I shared during the interview that certification processes sometimes do not build capacity and efficacy of teachers entering the field of education, Dr. Graham shared the following reflection:

If you come with little background to a complex area like writing, then your understanding and knowledge of it may be very small and the explanation, the important stuff, may be misleading. I think you're right in terms of your analysis of this as one reason we don't see as much writing and writing instruction going on. A lot of teachers don't feel comfortable as writers and they don't know a lot about writing or how to teach it. I hate to say that, but when we do national surveys, in a sense that's what teachers tell us. I actually think they give us a better picture of what's going on because nobody wants to say, "I'm not doing anything or I don't know how to do this." Even with that said, it's not very promising, the data that we do get.

One important aspect of Dr. Graham's work is how it connects to my interest in the reciprocity between reading and writing. He shared details regarding current projects focused on this topic, as evidenced by the following extract:

We have two meta-analyses that we're just finishing up the work on. We haven't written them up yet. We're doing the analysis. One is looking at, when you increase how much students read. When you teach reading... what are the effects on writing outcomes? Then the other one is when you have reading and writing instruction integrated, about 60-40 either way—maybe 60% reading instruction and 40% writing or vice versa. When you stay within that range, you get positive effects on both, reading and writing outcomes.

Dr. Graham illustrated an important benefit of interviewing experts as part of the literature review process in that there is an opportunity to analyze pre-published or grey literature (Onwuegbuzie & Frels, 2016). This aids in the relevancy of and comprehensive nature of the literature included in the review. As noted in the previous quotation, at the time of the interview, Dr. Graham and his team were working on writing up the results of the two meta-analyses. Since that time and during the writing of this article, he has sent the completed but unpublished manuscripts of these studies. Without engaging in the process of extending my CLR through the MODES and especially reaching out to experts in the field, I would have missed the opportunity to include these important recent findings!

An unexpected residual benefit that stemmed from interviewing Dr. Graham was feedback and probing questions regarding my study from someone who understands the complex nuances of my research questions—providing even more potential authenticity, relevance, and immediacy to my study. His remarks and encouragement continue to serve as motivation as I navigate through my research processes. He explained,

I wanted just, to offer that as a similar kind of thing to what you're doing, which is why I really like what you're doing because you can see if these guys progress better or the same as a control group. You can also then, take a look at some of the things from your observations that relate directly to what you wanted people to do. In a sense, it's a fidelity thing, but also can be looked at to see if those particular things are related to changes for the treatment group. Which then starts to unpack in a correlational way what happens in your study, which makes, I think, for a really powerful thing. Plus you've got added onto this, your discussions that you're going to have with the teachers. It's a very interesting study and it's obviously, very ambitious on your part. My hats off to you on this....I'm hoping that you'll share with me, and we'll talk again, as you start

looking at this and start working with your data. I'm really interested in what you're doing.

Another unexpected residual benefit that stemmed from interviewing Dr. Graham was that he shared with me two unpublished manuscripts (i.e., grey literature; the “D” in MODES) on which he was still working that were still extremely relevant for my dissertation. As such, through my Expert interview with Dr. Graham, I was able to obtain the most up-to-date relevant information from one of the leading experts in the area of developing writers—information that no-one else had seen at that point. Also, the findings from these ongoing works had the potential to provide me with secondary data (i.e., the “S” in MODES) that would serve as an extension or follow-up to the extant literature. Yet another unexpected residual benefit was that my interview of Dr. Graham led to me being aware of the numerous YouTube videos that he had developed in the area of writing instruction (cf. https://www.youtube.com/results?search_query=Steve+Graham+writing). These videos represented the “M” (i.e., Media) in MODES. The confidence gained from the first successful interview gave me courage to reach out to Dr. Janet Emig (1969), who conducted seminal research at Harvard University regarding process writing and to Dr. Joyce Armstrong Carroll, who brought the New Jersey Writing Project from Rutgers University to Texas, where the visionary project, New Jersey Writing Project in Texas (NJWPT), has been leading literacy since 1979. Carroll and Wilson (2008) explain,

Abydos [NJWPT] is not a program. Programs are reactionary because they try to repair something gone awry or something negative. They are always temporary, always following, never leading. They impose. Abydos [NJWPT] has grown out of a project born of vision. Vision grows out of a philosophy. It leads, opens the way to success, permits growth, flow, and natural development. It proposes. (p. xxix)

Both Dr. Emig and Dr. Carroll, like Dr. Graham, provided consent to use their full names for this article rather than a pseudonym in order to provide required details to establish them as experts and to provide meaningful yet identifying quotations to emphasize the value of the expert interview process. Again, an IRB submission was deemed unnecessary by the Research Compliance Administrator because the processes utilized constitute journalistic activities within the realm of oral histories. The following month after interviewing Dr. Graham, I conducted a connected series of expert interviews with Dr. Emig and Dr. Carroll focused on the historical importance of process writing and the reciprocity with reading, including the important connection between the work of Dr. Emig and Dr. Louise Rosenblatt. First, I interviewed Dr. Emig via telephone due to her living in Florida. For numerous reasons, including the reality that she is 88 years old, online spaces did not work for Dr. Emig, and she requested that we speak via telephone (i.e., offline space). Although different from an online or a face-to-face interview environment, rich data were collected. In fact, Holt (2010) provides evidence that there are unique benefits of focusing on the text rather than on the contextual levels of information (p. 114). At the inferential level, I detected a certain lift in her intonation that occurred when she spoke of ideas about which she was passionate, including the time that she spent at Harvard University under the shadow of Noam Chomsky. I learned information during the interview that I had never understood by reading her published works. During interviews with Dixie Goswami and Maureen Butler regarding her collection of essays, Emig (1983) indicated that she did not believe that men teachers were able to remove themselves in the same way as did women teachers. When I asked her whether she still believed this notion

or whether this statement was relevant only during that time period, she explained the following:

It was by my own experience. Women teachers I saw were more able to get out of the way. Here's where my own autobiography plays into it. Most of my advisors at Harvard, their ego got in the way of learning and they were extremely hostile to the whole writing process. You're talking to someone who—this is somewhat the result of my experience at Harvard.

Via the interview with Dr. Emig, I gained a deeper understanding of what was going on in the country regarding writing expectations at the college level and how research was driven by social and economic realities at the time, including the focus on writing accuracy and grammar and not writing processes (Ohmann, 1986). Dr. Emig explained,

It was at Harvard at the time when Chomsky was at his hay day. Most of the students I knew were doing studies of transformation of generative grammar, and I didn't find that he was interested in caring anything on writing.

Not only did this fill in historical gaps, but also it began to illustrate the strength that Janet Emig had as a person and as a woman researcher during the 1960s at Harvard University, and to emphasize the importance of her seminal study that helped pave the way for process-based writing. Prior to process-based writing, the method was to assign and to grade, as Emig explains, “Really, the approach was Monday we assign, Friday we collect. What happens between is between you and your God or your Goddess.”

The same week that I interviewed Dr. Emig, I also interviewed Dr. Carroll, and then because Dr. Emig was the dissertation chair for Dr. Carroll, I interviewed them together, using the data from the earlier transcripts to nudge follow-up questions and ideas. This yielded what Wilson, Onwuegbuzie, and Manning (2016) referred to as a *paired depth interview*, or *paired interviewing*, which involves one researcher interviewing two people together “for the purposes of collecting information about how the pair perceives the same event or phenomenon” (p. 1549)—which, as noted by Wilson et al. (2016), surprisingly, has received little attention in the qualitative research literature. In the three-way interview, I was face-to-face with Dr. Carroll and Dr. Emig was on the phone. When I interviewed Joyce Carroll, I asked what led her to Rutgers University to study under Janet Emig; she paused briefly and then shared the following, with audible energy and an increased tempo in her speech:

Janet was influenced by Dewey. Here I was, not even knowing I was influenced by Dewey at the time, went out and taught the way I was taught. Then, when I got this position to teach college, I knew I had to get my doctorate. Nothing would do but that I study under the great Emig, because I wanted to study writing. That's how I got to her. When I got to her, it was truly an intellectual awakening. It was like I was being prepared all those years. I wonder for all of us, if that's not what happens. We have to be able to be willing to embrace it when it does happen. It's also a little scary. It's very comfortable to just do what you've always done. I was a successful teacher. Why did I need to shift from assigning and assessing to this process thing?

In addition to adding to the value of my CLR, the richness of data from the three interviews could potentially lead to an important historical paper that would further add to and benefit the field of literacy.

Conclusions

In conceptualizing their expert interview concept, Onwuegbuzie and Frels (2016) provided an alternative epistemological model of the literature interview process in an attempt to “expand our ways of understanding how we come to know about our inner lives and social worlds” (Holstein & Gubrium, 2004, p. 157). These authors posited that by conducting expert interviews, the data obtained from the expert(s) can provide richer information that can enhance understanding (i.e., increasing *Verstehen*; Dilthey, 1961; Martin, 2000; Outhwaite, 1975) of the underlying phenomenon, thereby addressing, to a greater extent, what Denzin and Lincoln (2005) referred to as the triple crises of *representation* (i.e., which, in the context of literature reviews, characterizes how to capture authentically the extant literature), *legitimation* (i.e., which, in the context of literature reviews, characterizes how to evaluate the extant literature to in this contemporary, poststructural moment), and *praxis* (i.e., which, in the context of literature reviews, characterizes how “to effect change in the world if society is only and always a text?”; Denzin & Lincoln, 2005, p. 20). Further, expert interviews challenge reviewers to reflect further on the information that they extracted from the extant literature, thereby transforming the literature review process by enabling the reviewer to recognize the processes underlying the construction and interpretations made by the (prolific) authors of the extant literature.

By conducting expert interviews, the lead author operated under the assumption that data (i.e., information extracted from the extant literature) *do not speak for themselves*. Rather, she viewed this interview process as a meaning-making process that involved the deconstruction of each expert’s voice by linking what was stated by the expert to the extant literature. Thus, via the expert interview process, a new form of deconstructionism occurred (cf. Derrida, 1976), in which, as Fontana and Frey (2005) concluded,

the influence of the author is brought under scrutiny. Thus, the text created by the rendition of events by the researcher is “deconstructed”; the author’s biases and taken-for-granted notions are exposed, and sometimes alternative ways of looking at data are introduced. (p. 714)

The most important aspect of the lead author seeking out experts was the rich information gleaned and the depth added to her understanding of the extant literature. Additionally, she experienced a residual benefit in that she was able to compare online and offline environments for conducting expert interviews. Historically, clinical research interviews, especially in the area of psychology with the work of important cognitive researchers such as Freud and Piaget, were forerunners for conducting face-to-face interviews, even though they were in clinical settings (Brinkmann & Kvale, 2015). Although the difference in purpose between interviews for clinical experiments and those utilized to extend the literature review to yield a CLR are understood, the difficult nature of capturing data through interviews was chronicled by Piaget (1929) as he explained,

It is so hard not to talk too much when questioning a child, especially for a pedagogue! It is so hard not to be suggestive! And above all, it is so hard to find the middle course between systemization due to preconceived ideas and incoherence due to the absence of any directing hypothesis! The good experimenter must, in fact, unite two often incompatible qualities; he must know how to observe...and at the same time he must constantly be alert for something definitive, at every moment he must have some working hypothesis, some theory, true or false, which he is seeking to check. (p. 9)

These concerns shared by Piaget in 1929 are not dissimilar from difficulties experienced decades later. However, systematic literature regarding detailed processes for qualitative research interviews did not emerge for another 50 years (Brinkmann & Kvale, 2015; Kvale, 1996; Mishler, 1986; Rubin & Rubin, 1995; Spradley, 1979). Brinkmann and Kvale (2015) go beyond detailed processes and procedures for conducting interviews by also explaining the philosophical constructs that define a research interview as “an inter-view, where knowledge is constructed in the inter-action between the interviewer and the interviewee. An interview is literally an inter-view, an inter-change of views between two persons conversing about a theme of mutual interest” (p. 4). After transcribing and analyzing the transcripts from the expert interviews, an essential observation was that the three interview formats utilized in the 1-week period all met the condition of interview knowledge produced in a “conversational relation” that is “contextual, linguistic, narrative, and pragmatic” (Brinkmann & Kvale, 2015, p. 21). The interview environment, whether online or offline, did not impede the “inter-view” or “inter-action” necessary to engage in an “active process where interviewer and interviewee through their relationship produce knowledge” (Brinkmann & Kvale, p. 21).

Although the knowledge produced through the online and offline interview environments was rich and will extend and add value to the lead author’s CLR, there were relevant differences noted as well. Convenience for both the interviewer and the interviewee was important for this process. Attempting to fly to Arizona to interview Dr. Steve Graham and to Florida to interview Dr. Janet Emig would have been financially prohibitive, time prohibitive, and environmentally insensitive. Table 3 provides a comparison of attributes for each of the interview environments utilized by the lead author for this exemplar process and article. Although the interview experiences are specific to this research event, the observations might be relevant considerations for other researchers wanting to utilize expert interviews as parts of the MODES extension process.

Table 3 – *Comparison of Online and Offline Spaces for the Purpose of Expert Interviews: One Exemplar*

Attributes of Interview Environment	Face-to-Face	Traditional Telephone	Skype
Ability to capture a variety of non-verbal data	X		X
Ability to record synchronously with one device	X		X
Ability to conduct member checking	X	X	X
Ability to follow-up quickly with additional questions		X	X
Ability to ensure safety of the interviewer/ interviewee		X	X
		X	

Provides the most comfortable environment for persons with social anxiety			
Sensitive to environmental impact of interview		X	X
Respects privacy of interviewee		X	X
Sensitive to age and physical needs of interviewee		X	

Regardless of the whether offline- or online-based interviews are used, conducting expert interviews as part of the CLR process has logical appeal because it promotes a reflexive approach to the literature review process. Moreover, these experts help to bring the literature review process alive by connecting previously published text (i.e., the past) to the expert's voice that provides current (i.e., present) and even emerging (i.e., future) assumptions, ideas, thoughts, opinions, conceptualizations, experiences, concerns, challenges, motivations, intentions, theories, schemas, models, findings, evidence, and interpretations, as well as beliefs, propositions, expectations, predictions, hunches, and hypotheses. As such, expert interviews facilitate what Onwuegbuzie and Frels (2016) deem as an ultimate goal of the CLR, which involves the reviewer

document[ing] the relationship among authors' ideas, conceptualizations, theories, findings, and interpretations at different times and across different disciplines, as well as..identify[ing] covert linkages among the origins of an idea, its development, claims associated with the idea, evidence generated to support the claims, warrant that links the evidence claim and evidence, and context and assumptions used to provide justification (i.e., validity/legitimation) for the warrant and evidence. (Onwuegbuzie & Frels, 2016, p. 307)

Thus, expert interviews have significant potential for transforming the literature review process, going far beyond the traditional practice of only using the extant literature. Indeed, the conduct of expert interviews is consistent with Holstein and Gubrium's (1995) concept of active interviews, wherein these interviews represent active meaning-meaning activities. Further, these expert interviews advance the notion that the CLR process represents a contextually based story that is not only constructed by the literature reviewer (cf. Gubrium & Holstein, 2002) but also reflects a collaboration among the reviewer, text, and expert interviewees. More specifically, expert interviews allow the reviewer summarizing the extant literature (i.e., the "what") to make more transparent the processes, negotiations, outcomes, and other interactive facets that occurred in the past by explicating the connection between the expert interviewee's current thinking and reflections and her/his previously documented (i.e., published) narrative (i.e., the "how"), thereby allowing the reviewer to incorporate each expert's live and fluid information into the final CLR report. In fact, if the literature reviewer deems this form of storytelling appropriate and meaningful, he/she could facilitate her/his voice being interspersed with the expert's voice in an autoethnographical manner (Ellis & Berger, 2002)—as did the lead author in the previous section—which can generate a deeper contextual understanding (Banister, 1999). Moreover, the expert interview process can help the literature

reviewer reach a circle of understanding, or what is referred to as a *hermeneutic circle* (Warren, 2002).

As can be seen from the heuristic example, expert interviews can be used to extract more meaning from the extant literature. Even more importantly, the information gleaned from the expert interview process can help literature reviewers better to contextualize the extant literature by facilitating them in placing it in an appropriate historical context, motivating literature reviewers to strive for the following best practices posited by Onwuegbuzie (2017) that include maximizing non-maleficence (i.e., not harming others); beneficence (i.e., performing good actions); (social) justice (i.e., making decisions based on universal principles and rules, impartially and justifiably in order to guarantee that all people are treated fairly and equitably), and fidelity (i.e., demonstrating trustworthiness, authenticity, and commitment). These and other best practices, in their totality, enable reviewers to be what Onwuegbuzie (2017) referred to as being *meta-ethical*, which comprises adherence both to *pragmatic ethics* (i.e., using the standards set by communities that are assumed to be developing morally alongside the progression of scientific knowledge) and *virtue ethics* (i.e., using the character of the researcher as the reference point for ethical behavior, instead of focusing on rules).

By conducting expert interviews, the literature reviewer serves as an advocate of the integrity of the literature review process, helping to ensure that this advocacy stems directly from each expert's voice and does not merely reflect preconceived biases that the reviewer introduces overtly or covertly into the literature review process. Simply stated, using expert interviews as a component of the literature review process transforms this process into what Onwuegbuzie, Leech, and Collins (2008) called a "methodology of story-sharing" (p. 14).

We hope that the lead author's exemplar is helpful for researchers wanting to utilize Onwuegbuzie and Frels's (2016) process of conducting expert interviews to yield a CLR. Additionally, we hope that this exemplar and the ideas presented is useful for instructors of research methodology courses by providing concrete, systematic ways to alleviate the problem regarding inadequate reviews of the literature and specifically "failure by authors to critically interrogate the literature" (Alton-Lee, 1998, p. 889).

Each expert interview process provided the lead author with an opportunity to dig deeper into the literature and to view the ideas and findings through a historical, a modern, and a connected lens, linking the underlying research questions to the important idea of why her research questions matter or how she might adjust her questions so that her study matters even more. She was able to identify important patterns and to understand the historical path that literacy has taken in the United States by interviewing experts in the field who already own important concepts and contexts that are not inherent in the literature. The process also led her to dig deeper into the research to discover how ideas that emerged during the interviews were connected; she was led to keep asking questions that continue to propel her back into the literature beyond the literature review phase. Why did John Dewey Matter? How was Chomsky connected to writing process research? What are the current studies being conducted in the field? What do the most current meta-analyses reveal? Thus, the seven steps toward a comprehensive literature review of Onwuegbuzie and Frels (2016) in general and the MODES in particular provide a concrete, systematic, progressive, and manageable methodology for shifting the role of the literature review from a linear product to a dynamic, integrated, and engaging process, affording pathways for helping reviewers conduct CLRs, that, in the words of Onwuegbuzie (2017), occur "in the moment" (p. xvii), and, in the case of expert interviews conducted in online spaces, occur "in the Methodological Innovation moment" wherein literature reviewers "transcend this methodological contestation and methodological divide by taking advantage of the innovative approaches to reflexivity....and the latest technology and computer-mediated communication" (p. xvii).

References

- Almasi, J. F., O'Flahavan, J. F., & Arya, P. (2001). A comparative analysis of student and teacher development in more and less proficient discussions of literature. *Reading Research Quarterly, 36*, 96-120. doi:10.1598/RRQ.36.2.1
- Alton-Lee, A. (1998). A troubleshooter's checklist for prospective authors derived from reviewers' critical feedback. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 14*, 887-890. doi:10.1016/S0742-051X(98)90000-2
- Applebee, A. N., & Langer, J. A. (2013). *Writing instruction that works: Proven methods for middle and high school classrooms*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Applegate, A. J., & Applegate, M. K. (2004). The Peter effect: Reading habits and attitudes of preservice teachers. *Reading Teacher, 57*, 554-563.
- Atwell, N. (1987). *In the middle: Writing, reading, and learning with adolescents*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook Publishers.
- Banister, E. M. (1999). Evolving reflexivity: Negotiating meaning of women's midlife experience. *Qualitative Inquiry, 5*(1), 3-23. doi:10.1177/107780049900500101
- Bertrand, C., & Bourdeau, L. (2010). Research interviews by Skype: A new data collection method. In J. Esteves (Ed.), *Proceedings from the 9th European Conference on Research Methods*, (pp. 70-79). Madrid, Spain: IE Business School.
- Boote, D. N., & Beile, P. (2005). Scholars before researchers: On the centrality of the dissertation literature review in research preparation. *Educational Researcher, 34*(6), 3-15. doi:10.3102/0013189X034006003.
- Bright, P. (2011, May 10). Microsoft buys Skype for \$8.5 billion. Why, exactly? *Wired*. Retrieved from <https://www.wired.com/2011/05/microsoft-buys-skype-2/>
- Brinkmann, S., & Kvale, S. (2015). *InterViews: Learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Carroll, J. A., & Wilson, E. E. (2008). *Acts of teaching: How to teach writing*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Cho, J., & Trent, A. (2006). Validity in qualitative research. *Qualitative Research, 6*, 319-340. doi:10.1177/1468794106065006.
- Collins, K. M. T., Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Sutton, I. L. (2006). A model incorporating the rationale and purpose for conducting mixed methods research in special education and beyond. *Learning Disabilities: A Contemporary Journal, 4*(1), 67-100.
- Combs, J. P., Bustamante, R. M., & Onwuegbuzie, A. J. (2010). An interactive model for facilitating development of literature reviews. *International Journal of Multiple Research Approaches, 4*, 159-182. doi:10.5172/mra.2010.4.2.159.
- Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Denham, M. A., & Onwuegbuzie, A. J. (2013). Beyond words: Using nonverbal communication data in research to enhance thick description and interpretation. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 12*(1), 670-696. doi:10.1177/160940691301200137
- Deakin, H., & Wakefield, K. (2014). Skype interviewing: Reflections of two PhD researchers. *Qualitative Research, 14*, 603-616. doi: 10.1177/1468794113488126.
- Dennett, D. C. (1991). *Consciousness explained*. Boston, MA: Little, Brown and Co.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2005). Introduction: The discipline and practice of qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed., pp. 1-32). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Derrida, J. (1976). *Of grammatology* (G. C. Spivak, Trans.). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

- Dilthey, W. (1961). *Patterns and meanings in history* (H. P. Ruckman, Trans.). New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Ellis, C., & Berger, L. (2002). Their story/my story/our story: Including the researcher's experience in interview research. In J. Gubrium & J. Holstein (Eds.), *Handbook of interview research: Context and method* (pp. 849-876). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Emig, J. (1983). *The web of meaning: Essays on writing, teaching, learning, and thinking*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton Cook.
- Emig, J. (1969). *Components of the composing process among twelfth-grader writers* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Harvard University. Cambridge, MA.
- Fontana, A., & Frey, J. H. (2005). The interview: From neutral stance to political involvement. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 695-727). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Gerber, H. R., Abrams, S. S., Curwood, J. S., & Magnifico, A. (2017). *Conducting qualitative research of learning in online spaces*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Gubrium, J. F., & Holstein, J. A. (2002). *Handbook of interview research: Context and method*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hale, M. (2011). *Middle school language arts teachers as readers*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Houston, Houston, Texas.
- Hanna, P. (2012). Using internet technologies (such as Skype) as a research medium: A research note. *Qualitative Research*, 12, 239-242. doi:10.1177/1468794111426607.
- Holstein, J. A., & Gubrium, J. F. (1995). *The active interview*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Holstein, J. A., & Gubrium, J. F. (2004). The active interview. In D. Silverman (Ed.), *Qualitative research: Theory, method, and practice* (pp. 140-161). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Holt, A. (2010). Using the telephone for narrative interviewing: A research note. *Qualitative Research*, 10(1), 113-121. doi:10.1177/1468794109348686.
- Janesick V. J. (2016). *Stretching exercises for qualitative researchers* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Janghorban, R., Roudsari, R. L., & Taghipour, A. (2014). Skype interviewing: The new generation of online synchronous interview in qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies on Health and Well-Being*, 9(1). doi:10.3402/qhw.v9.24152.
- Kvale, S. (1996). *Interviews: An introduction to qualitative research interviewing*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Laminack, L. L., & Wadsworth, R. M. (2015). *Writers are readers: Flipping reading instruction into writing opportunities*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Langer, J. A. (2000). Excellence in English in middle and high school: How teachers' professional lives support student achievement. *American Educational Research Association*, 37, 397-439. doi:10.3102/00028312037002397.
- Manning, K. (1997). Authenticity in constructivist inquiry: Methodological considerations without prescription. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 3(1), 93-115. doi:10.1177/107780049700300105.
- Martin, M. (2000). *Verstehen: The uses of understanding in social science*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.
- Matuschak, A. (2006). Camtasia 2 (Version 2.7.1) [Software]. Retrieved from <http://www.techsmith.com/camtasia/>
- Maxwell, J. A. (1992). Understanding and validity in qualitative research. *Harvard Educational Review*, 62, 279-301. doi:10.17763/haer.62.3.8323320856251826
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Miller, G. A. (1983). Informavores. In F. Machlup & U. Mansfield (Eds.), *The study of information: Interdisciplinary messages* (pp. 111-113). New York, NY: Wiley.
- Mishler, E. G. (1986). *Research interviewing: Context and narrative*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Newkirk, T. (2014). *Minds made for stories: How we really read and write informational and persuasive texts*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Nielsen, J., & Loranger, H. (2006). *Prioritizing web usability*. Berkeley, CA: New Riders.
- Oates, J. (2015). Use of Skype in interviews: The impact of the medium in a study of mental health nurses. *Nurse Researcher*, 22(4), 13-17. doi:10.7748/nr.22.4.13.e1318.
- Ohmann, R. (1986). Reading and writing, work and leisure. In T. Newkirk (Ed.) *Only connect: Uniting reading and writing* (pp. 11-26). Upper Montclair, NJ: Boynton/Cook Publishers.
- Onwuegbuzie, A. J. (2017). Foreword: Conducting qualitative research in the moment. In H. R. Gerber, S. S. Abrams, J. S. Curwood, & A. Magnifico (Eds.). *Conducting qualitative research of learning in online spaces* (pp. xi-xviii). London, England: Sage.
- Onwuegbuzie, A. J., Collins, K. M. T., Leech, N. L., Dellinger, A. B., & Jiao, Q. G. (2010). A meta-framework for conducting mixed research syntheses for stress and coping researchers and beyond. In G. S. Gates, W. H. Gmelch, & M. Wolverson (Series Eds.) & K. M. T. Collins, A. J. Onwuegbuzie, & Q. G. Jiao (Vol. Eds.), *Toward a broader understanding of stress and coping: Mixed methods approaches* (pp. 169-211). The Research on Stress and Coping in Education Series (Vol. 5). Charlotte, NC: Information Age.
- Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Daniel, L. G. (2005). Editorial: Evidence-based guidelines for publishing articles in *Research in the Schools* and beyond. *Research in the Schools*, 12(2), 1-11.
- Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Frels, R. K. (2016). *Seven steps to a comprehensive literature review: A multimodal and cultural approach*. London, England: Sage.
- Onwuegbuzie, A. J., Leech, N. L., & Collins, K. M. T. (2008). Interviewing the interpretive researcher: A method for addressing the crises of representation, legitimation, and praxis. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 7(4), 1-17. doi:10.1177/160940690800700401
- Onwuegbuzie, A. J., Leech, N. L., & Collins, K. M. T. (2012). Qualitative analysis techniques for the review of the literature. *The Qualitative Report*, 17(28), 1-28. Retrieved from <http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR17/onwuegbuzie.pdf>
- Outhwaite, W. (1975). *Understanding social life: The method called Verstehen*. London, England: George Allen & Unwin.
- Piaget, J. (1929). *The child's conception of the world*. London, England: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Pirolli, P., & Card, S. (1999). Information foraging. *Psychological Review*, 106, 643-675. doi:10.1037/0033-295x.106.4.643.
- Rosenblatt, L. (1978). *The reader the text the poem: The transactional theory of the literary work*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Rosenblatt, L. (1994). The transactional theory of reading and writing. In D. E. Alvermann, N. J. Unrau, & R. B. Ruddell (Eds.), *Theoretical models and processes of reading* (pp. 923-956). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Roulston, K. (2010). Considering quality in qualitative interviewing. *Qualitative Research*, 10, 199-228. doi:10.1177/1468794109356739.
- Rubin, H. J., & Rubin, I. (1995). *Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Shapka, J. D., Domene, J. F., Khan, S., & Yang, L. M. (2016). Online versus in-person

- interviews with adolescents: An exploration of data equivalence. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 58(C), 361-367. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2016.01.016
- Spradley, J. P. (1979). *The ethnographic interview*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Warren, C. A. B. (2002). Qualitative interviewing: In J. Gubrium & J. Holstein (Eds.), *Handbook of interview research: Context and method* (pp. 83-101). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Williams, J. K. (2018). A comprehensive review of seven steps to a comprehensive literature review. *The Qualitative Report*, 23, 345-349. Retrieved from <http://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol23/iss2/4>
- Wilson, A. D., Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Manning, L. P. (2016). Using paired depth interviews to collect qualitative data. *The Qualitative Report*, 21, 1549-1573. Retrieved from <http://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol21/iss9/1>
- Yates, L. (2004) *What does good education research look like? Situating a field and its practices*. Maidenhead, England: Open University Press.

Author Note

Alana Morris is a doctoral candidate in the Literacy Program at Sam Houston State University and the Director of Personalized Professional Learning in Spring Branch Independent School District in Houston, Texas. Correspondence regarding this article can be addressed directly to: afm008@SHSU.edu.

Anthony J. Onwuegbuzie is Professor in the Department of Educational Leadership at Sam Houston State University, where he teaches doctoral-level courses in qualitative research, quantitative research, and mixed research, including program evaluation. Further, he is a Distinguished Visiting Professor at the University of Johannesburg. As immediate Past President of the Mixed Methods International Research Association (MMIRA), and as someone who is passionate about qualitative research, quantitative research, and mixed research, Tony co-authored the SAGE mixed research textbook with Rebecca Frels (Lamar University), entitled, *Seven Steps to a Comprehensive Literature Review: A Multimodal and Cultural Approach*, in which they conceptualized the notion of MODES that motivated the current article. Correspondence regarding this article can also be addressed directly to: tonyonwuegbuzie@aol.com.

Hannah R. Gerber is an Associate Professor of Literacy at Sam Houston State University. Hannah teaches graduate and doctoral classes in qualitative methods, digital ethnography, and digital literacies. She has published extensively on the connection between video games and adolescent literacy in top peer-reviewed journals, has co-authored and co-edited multiple books, including co-authoring the SAGE book, *Conducting Qualitative Research of Learning in Online Spaces*, and has served as an invited keynote speaker at numerous national and international literacy, technology, and learning conferences. Correspondence regarding this article can also be addressed directly to: hrg004@SHSU.EDU.

Copyright 2018: Alana Morris, Anthony J. Onwuegbuzie, Hannah R. Gerber, and Nova Southeastern University.

Article Citation

Morris, A., Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Gerber, H. R. (2018). Using expert interviews within MODES in online and offline spaces to extend comprehensive literature review processes. *The Qualitative Report*, 23(8), 1777-1798. Retrieved from <https://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol23/iss8/1>
