

Qual+ Newsletter

Issue 5: EIBA 2024

20.01.2025



Contents

<i>Welcome to the EIBA 2024 Special Issue!.....</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>Celebrating Fifty Years of Process Research in International Management.....</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>EIBA 2024 Workshop Spotlights</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>EIBA 2024 Contributions to Methodology.....</i>	<i>12</i>
<i>Upcoming Qual+ Events.....</i>	<i>14</i>
<i>Featured Courses.....</i>	<i>15</i>
<i>Sign Up for Updates and Announcements</i>	<i>16</i>

Welcome to the EIBA 2024 Special Issue!

Welcome to the first issue of the Qual+ Newsletter in 2025!

This issue is dedicated to the 50th Anniversary Conference of the European International Business Academy (EIBA) which was held at Aalto University in Finland on December 12-14, 2024. Inspired by Murray S. Davis (1971) article that posed the question what makes theories interesting, the conference theme was “That’s Interesting! Rethinking IB Research for the Next 50 Years”. It was an open invitation to rethink IB research from the viewpoint of the phenomena that we study, the research questions that we pose, the theoretical approaches that we draw on as well as the paradigms and methodologies that we use. In this issue, we share some of the most interesting methodological highlights of the conference.

Qual+ participated in EIBA by co-hosting one pre-conference and three post-conference workshops on research methods and theorizing. The workshop by the Academy of Management Review was devoted to developing and publishing theory papers, while the three other workshops covered the use of qualitative and quantitative methods in the field of International Business (IB). While one of the qualitative workshops dealt with the timely topic of “Qualitative Data Analysis in the AI Era: Key Considerations for IB Researchers”, the other workshop took a deep dive into “Making the Invisible Visible: Evolving Methodologies in a Changing Research Landscape”. The use of quantitative research methods was the focal point of the third workshop entitled “Complexity in IB Research and How to Address it Methodologically via Advanced Quantitative Methods”.

In this issue, we have included participants’ reflections on these workshops and emerging topics of conference papers that introduce methodological innovations, raise questions about research ethics, and introduce paradigmatic debates.

Enjoy this issue and all the very best for the new year 2025!



Celebrating Fifty Years of Process Research in International Management

Yves L. Doz

The Solvay Chaired Professor of Technological Innovation, Professor of Strategic Management (Emeritus)

As part of the EIBA 50th Anniversary held in Helsinki in December 2024, Catherine Welch, Eero Vaara and I had the privilege of running a panel, attended by about 30 conference participants, on providing a perspective on 50 years of process research in international management, since the creation of EIBA.

Our starting point was the work I am undertaking with contributing colleagues for a forthcoming book on understanding, critiquing, and assessing CK Prahalad's five main contribution areas to management knowledge : the relative power of managers with different strategic orientations in multinationals, entrepreneurial internationalization strategies, the dominant logic in organizations, serving the “bottom of the pyramid” markets, and the co-creation of customer experiences.

CK’s seminal contribution to process research in international management was to establish that in managing multinational management, how decisions were reached by executives who brought different perspectives and priorities and brought their sources of power to bear on these decisions mattered more than the organizational form taxonomies of earlier researchers. To be able to research decision processes, he pioneered a form of process research inspired by ethnography and organizational sociology that started with describing the processes (through interviews and process observations) and building or abducting theory from understanding the phenomenon. He was not doing action research per se: he could productively integrate research, teaching, and consulting activities in ways that most academics could not (a method chapter in the forthcoming book is largely devoted to how he made such integration effective).

Catherine Welch’s “fast forward” review allowed us and the audience to see how the concepts and approaches pioneered by CK Prahalad have been further developed since CK made his contributions and are still relevant today. In particular, she focused on strategic redirection in large, complex firms, building on her recent work with Jacqueline Mees-Buss and Eleanor Westney on the evolution of Unilever. She built on a model of strategic redirection first put forward by CK Prahalad but since neglected, and framed the redirection processes she observed as a selection process among strategic initiatives leading to a transformation of Unilever from a multi-domestic organization to a “neo-global” form focused on efficiency (however, since the study, Unilever now finds itself challenged by growing deglobalization and deepening local embeddedness and integration on the part of domestic competitors).

Eero Vaara, in a more conceptual overview written in 2020, explained how history and the historical embeddedness of major companies matter. Based on his research, he showed how historical embeddedness can be used by management to achieve strategic change through the processes of Elaborating, Recovering, and Decoupling. He also brought to our attention the importance of counterfactual thought experiments.

All in all, we were providing very complementary contributions and hope we showed to the audience the value of qualitative process research in studying changes in the strategies and organizational forms of multinational companies: researching the “why” and the “how” through field research remains essential.



EIBA 2024 Workshop Spotlights

AMR Workshop: Developing and publishing theory papers

This workshop was facilitated by **Dana Minbaeva** (King's College London), **Taco Reus** (Erasmus University), **Joep Cornelissen** (Rotterdam School of Management), **Grazia D. Santangelo** (Copenhagen Business School), and **Harun Emre Yildiz** (Mälardalen University).

Reflections by Jakob Westergren

The *Academy of Management Review* (AMR) workshop took place on the opening day of the 50th European International Business Academy (EIBA) conference. It was the first time a dedicated AMR workshop had been organized during the EIBA conference. The session was structured around three main components. First, attendees received a concise introduction to the AMR journal by current and former associate editors (Minbaeva and Cornelissen, respectively). Second, together with members of the editorial review board (Reus,

Santangelo, and Yildiz) and the associate editors, attendees got to engage in a discussion about different forms of theorizing and how these different forms fit with the scope of AMR compared to other journals. Third, those attendees who had submitted short proposals for a theoretical paper prior to the workshop had the opportunity to get exclusive feedback from associate editors and members of the review board.

The workshop provided an important space to further reflect upon what theory is and how it might be done, for junior and senior scholars alike. As was observed by Abend (2008, p. 174) 16 years ago, “semantic confusions about the word ‘theory’ have led to much miscommunication [...] Rather than an abstract philosophical problem, this is a practical problem”. Despite the persistence of the problem Abend observed, many PhD programs appear to be heavily preoccupied with teaching methods. The members of the review board suggested that it is much rarer to hear about PhD students who are explicitly trained to nourish their theorizing capabilities. The capacity for theorizing is a skill many junior scholars, therefore, must learn the hard way – which sometimes can be quite a debilitating experience. With that in mind, the workshop provided invaluable encouragement to wrestle with theorizing.

The AMR workshop was also appreciated as it provoked discussions about the boundary conditions of theory building in specialized journals, such as AMR and Organization Theory (OT), and general interest journals, such as the Journal of International Business Studies and Organization Studies. At this stage of the PhD program, I consider myself acquainted with many of the management journals, but there are nuances to each outlet that are far from self-evident for the untrained eye. For example, AMR predominantly focuses on proposition-based theorizing but is increasingly becoming accepting of process- and typology-based theorizing. AMR also demands that one’s theorizing should lead to testable knowledge claims. Compare this with the European journal Organization Theory, which has an outspoken pluralistic approach to theorizing and alternative ways of writing theory papers. Yet, both are committed to formative papers: that is, papers in AMR and OT should help a broader set of academic audiences to think differently about the interrogated phenomenon or theory.

All in all, I am grateful to have been offered the opportunity to partake in this workshop. I hope future EIBA organizers pursue the now-established tradition of bringing together representatives of journals focused on theory to help us make sense of this oddity known as theory. Not only does it provide academics the opportunity to engage in clarifying discussions about theory, but sessions like these also introduce diversity to the garden of theorizing!

Jakob Westergren is a sixth-year doctoral student from the organization group at Uppsala University, Sweden. He is currently visiting the organization and management group at the Department of Management Studies, Aalto University School of Business. His doctoral dissertation focuses on how upper secondary schools enact competition.

Qualitative Research in the AI Era: An Interactive Workshop

Professor **Catherine Welch** (Qual+ International Advisory Board Member, Trinity College, Ireland), Lecturer **Duc Nguyen** (Alliance Manchester Business School, UK), Professor **Eriikka Paavilainen-Mäntymäki** (University of Turku, Finland), and Professor **Emmanuella Plakoyiannaki** (University of Vienna, Austria) facilitated this interactive post-conference workshop.



Photo: Angelos Angelakis

From Scholars to Moderators? Reflections on Navigating AI's Impact on Qualitative Research by Dmitrij Slepnirov (*Associate Professor | Aalborg University Business School*)

Artificial Intelligence (AI) is rapidly reshaping the landscape of qualitative research. But how? Why? Should we be excited or concerned? A huge Thank you to Catherine Welch, Duc Nguyen, Eriikka Paavilainen-Mäntymäki, and Emmanuella Plakoyiannaki for an inspiring and thought-provoking post-conference session that brought us closer to answering these questions.

This workshop provided a very engaging exploration of the intersection between AI tools, such as ChatGPT, and traditional qualitative methodologies. The presenters underscored the transformative potential of AI while also highlighting significant challenges and ethical considerations. Here, I reflect on the three primary takeaways that resonated most deeply with me: the tension between efficiency and depth, the irreplaceable human element, and the ethical responsibilities of researchers. Interwoven throughout was a provocative question: are we, as academics, gradually becoming mere (Assistant, Associate and Full) content moderators for AI systems?

Efficiency vs. Depth: The Double-Edged Sword of AI: One of the most discussed topics was the trade-off AI imposes between efficiency and analytical depth. Tools like ChatGPT can process vast amounts of data in minutes, enabling researchers to experiment with modeling

parameters and preliminary coding. However, this efficiency comes at a cost - AI's outputs often lack the depth and nuance essential to qualitative research. AI models rely on statistical, autoregressive methods, generating text that mimics human language without understanding it.

For example, transforming words into numerical representations and vectors reduces rich, contextual meanings to mere data points. This preprocessing often strips away the very essence of qualitative data—its subjectivity and messiness. While AI might generate plausible summaries or organize themes superficially, the underlying analysis remains shallow and prone to errors.

The workshop's critique served as a reminder that efficiency should not overshadow the fundamental purpose of qualitative research: to uncover depth, nuance, and the complexity of human experiences. Yet, as AI tools increasingly handle these preliminary processes, there is an uncomfortable realization that researchers are being pushed into the role of content moderators -correcting and validating AI's imperfect outputs rather than engaging in deeper analytical work.

The Irreplaceable Human Element: A recurring theme was the irreplaceable role of the researcher in qualitative inquiry. Unlike AI, researchers bring intuition, creativity, and a capacity for reflective interpretation to their work. The presenters argued that qualitative research is inherently an act of co-creation, where the researcher's presence, emotions, and theoretical lens shape the process and outcomes.

For instance, AI's inability to grasp metaphors, contextual subtleties, or emotional nuances underscores its limitations. During the session, one presenter poignantly noted that AI cannot identify what is absent or silent in the data—a crucial aspect of qualitative inquiry. The richness of qualitative research often lies in what is not immediately visible, in the silences, contradictions, and layered meanings that only a human mind can discern.

However, the increasing reliance on AI tools threatens to shift researchers away from their core strengths. Instead of engaging as creators of knowledge, academics risk becoming mere custodians of AI outputs, confined to roles as (drawing a parallel with the academic career ladder, Assistant, Associate, or Full) Content Moderators. This hierarchical metaphor highlights the irony of researchers being in danger of reducing to validating machine-generated text rather than producing original insights.

Ethical Considerations and Researcher Responsibility: Another significant focus was the ethical implications of integrating AI into qualitative research. AI tools like ChatGPT depend on training data that is often biased, incomplete, or ethically compromised. Additionally, researchers who use these tools are, in effect, content moderators for AI developers, providing free labor to refine these models without clear acknowledgment or benefit.

One presenter highlighted a critical concern: AI's predisposition to confirm biases rather than challenge them. AI risks reinforcing existing inequalities and misrepresentations by

regurgitating patterns from its training data. This poses a dilemma for researchers who aim to produce socially responsible and equitable scholarship.

The workshop emphasized the need for researchers to maintain ethical rigor when using AI. This includes acknowledging the limitations of AI-generated insights, critically evaluating its outputs, and protecting participant data from potential misuse. But as researchers spend increasing amounts of time “tuning” and “moderating” AI outputs, they risk being relegated to the periphery of the research process, a role reminiscent of industrial content moderation rather than academic inquiry.

Closing Thoughts: This workshop was a powerful reminder of AI's evolving challenges and opportunities for qualitative research. While AI can enhance certain aspects of data processing, its limitations in interpretation, imagination, and ethical accountability are profound. Qualitative research's depth, reflexivity, and commitment to understanding human complexity remain firmly rooted in the researcher's unique role. However, the danger of becoming AI's content moderators looms large. Are we trading our agency and intellectual depth for efficiency? If researchers succumb to this shift, the field risks losing its critical and interpretive edge, becoming a mere extension of machine learning pipelines. To prevent this, we must resist the allure of efficiency at the expense of depth and meaning. Instead, we should strive to integrate AI thoughtfully, preserving the core values of qualitative inquiry. This balance will ensure that our research remains innovative and true to its purpose: illuminating the intricate tapestry of human experiences.

Dmitrij Slepnirov is an Associate Professor at Aalborg University Business School, Denmark. He is the Head of International Business Research Group at Aalborg University Business School and the Head of Educational Programme in Innovation Management at the Sino-Danish Center (SDC), University of Chinese Academy of Science, Beijing.

Making the Invisible Visible: Evolving Methodologies in a Changing Research Landscape – Qualitative workshop

This workshop was facilitated by Professor **Jo Angouri** (Founding Member of Qual+, University of Warwick, UK, and Aalto University, Finland), **Linh Duong** (Åbo Akademi University, Finland), **Anastasia Koptsyukh**, **Linyu Liu**, **Claire Shaw**, **Aracely Soto-Simeone**, and **Valentina Voimavuo** (Aalto University, Finland), as well as **Maria Pineda Escobar** (Erasmus University Rotterdam, Netherlands).

Reflections by Dan Ha Le (Doctoral researcher at the Turku School of Economics)

I decided to spend my Sunday attending the Qualitative Workshop: Making the Invisible Visible: Evolving Methodologies in a Changing Research Landscape as part of the EIBA's post-conference activities. My curiosity drew me to this workshop, as the terms 'invisible' and 'visible' resonated with my PhD journey, particularly in making sense of the rich yet complex qualitative data I've been working with. I think the organizing team did a fantastic

job of creating a space where researchers could reflect, co-create, and share their own views on qualitative approaches. I can conclude by saying that” curiosity didn’t kill the cat”!



Photo: Anastasia Koptsyukh

The workshop was full of insights from both facilitators and participants. We started by introducing ourselves through visual images representing our research thinking or linking to the workshop’s theme. We shared a common sentiment: conducting research is akin to ‘finding structures in chaos’ and navigating the ‘darkness’ when studying social phenomena. Facilitators also shared their own research stories that added relevance and authenticity to the discussions. Aracely’s experience with hard-to-reach data and Linyu’s discovery of gendered informal socialization (the smoking room) in China’s R&D settings were enjoyable. I related to Valentina’s challenges with choosing the qualitative analytical tools, and the follow-up exercise showed how easily we can go astray if we use inappropriate tools or interpret data too superficially. Linh’s insights on inferencing/ interpreting gender and power imbalances in the pitch coaching she observed were thought-provoking and open to debate 😊. Claire sparked discussions on (critical) self-reflection and the ethics of using open data. At the same time, Anastasia enriched the conversation by sharing her lived experience as a researcher, social entrepreneur, and volunteer during the Russia-Ukraine war. These discussions prompted me to rethink my stance and my various roles, which can influence how I perceive the world and conduct research.

Overall, the interactive nature of the workshop encouraged interesting reflections on our research journeys. Surprisingly, the self-reflection session also ignited fascinating conversations about the tension between theory-driven and problem-driven research and about the confusion between uncovering truths or contrasting what is considered accurate vs. untrue. I, therefore, found Jo’s closing message powerful: there is no silver bullet or master key that ‘unlocks all rooms’ in qualitative research. As qualitative researchers, we must be mindful and choose the right ‘key’ for the rooms we wish to explore and tell the

stories that emerge from our work. While we have the freedom to select methods, we also bear the responsibility of ensuring the appropriateness and integrity of our research.

Dan Ha Le is a second-year doctoral researcher at the Turku School of Economics, University of Turku, Finland. Her research interest lies in the lived experiences of internationally mobile individuals, focusing on how they pursue holistic self-fulfilment in their personal and professional lives. She primarily employs qualitative methods in her research inquiries.

Reflections by Tuuli Hakkarainen (Assistant Professor of Human Resource Management and Organisational Behavior, University of Liverpool)

The qualitative research workshop “Making the Invisible Visible: Evolving Methodologies in a Changing Research Landscape” was an excellent opportunity to discuss our experiences of doing qualitative fieldwork in a supportive and friendly atmosphere. It was fascinating to hear others’ stories, for example, how making sense of qualitative data can feel “chaotic” at times – a specific word many participants use to describe their experiences. While the focus on qualitative research tends to be on tradition and specific research methods, this well-organized and interactive workshop focused on various analytical tools to help navigate qualitative research. In brief, the workshop provided new ideas and reflection points central to being a qualitative researcher.

While the research topics might differ, many aspects of “being in the field” are shared among researchers. For example, we reflected on our experiences dealing with surprises when collecting qualitative data. What should the researcher do when understanding the cultural context better? Or when interviewees resist the theoretical labels imposed on them? When sharing the examples, we learned that most surprises related to data or phenomenon accessibility challenges and many other aspects ranging from collecting and analyzing data to reporting and engaging with reviewers. Choosing to ignore or embrace the surprises is just one of the many choices one must make as a qualitative researcher.

The workshop also included another important topic: critical self-reflection, which is not always easy. In practice, this reflection can include research ethics, among other choices researchers must make, such as managing inherent tensions, prioritization, and stakeholder expectations. Having this unique opportunity to spend the day discussing our experiences was something I will cherish for a long time.

Tuuli Hakkarainen is an Assistant Professor of Human Resource Management and Organisational behavior at the University of Liverpool Management School. Tuuli's interdisciplinary research focuses on expertise sharing in global projects and the role of advanced technology in multinational organizations.

Complexity in IB Research and How to Address it Methodologically via Advanced Quantitative Method

Bo Bernhard Nielsen (University of Sydney), **Stewart Miller** (Durham University), **Marianna Marra** (Politecnico de Milano), and **Desislava Dikova** (WU Vienna) delivered a high-spirited post-conference quantitative workshop on advanced quantitative techniques.

Session 1: Conceptualizing complexity in international business.

Professor Nielsen led discussions on the three dimensions of complexity: (1) multiplicity (of entities), (2) multiplexity of interactions, and (3) dynamism of global business phenomena. This conceptualization aimed at setting the stage for subsequent examples of how various advanced quantitative techniques may be helpful in addressing some – if not all – of these complexity dimensions. Professor Nielsen then moved on to discuss particularly multilevel modeling with emphasis on cross-classified random coefficient modeling to address all three complexity dimensions in IB research, and he provided an example from the multinational-performance literature (which would later be followed up by Desislava). He also briefly touched on advanced SEM modeling, including latent growth modeling, to address, particularly the dynamism dimension.

Session 2: Event study techniques for coping with complexity in IB.

Professor Miller led a discussion around the use of event study techniques to address several of the complexity dimensions and provided examples of how to conduct such studies. His examples of how to create event windows around, for instance, stock market reactions to various events, provided strong evidence of the strength of such dynamic and longitudinal event analysis for various types of IB phenomena, such as cross-border acquisitions or IJVs. This led to a spirited discussion about non-traditional event study opportunities given the nature and complexity of IB phenomena and the event of new datatypes (i.e. clickstream data and big data). Professor Miller also provided insight into the pros/cons of the technique as well as suggestions regarding software.

Session 3: Bibliometric and network methodology and complexity in IB

Professor Marra leads a discussion on utilizing network analysis in general and bibliometric analysis in particular to explore complex patterns in publications, citations, patents, etc. Professor Marra explained various types of analyses, including co-occurrence, co-citations, and bibliographic coupling. This led to a spirited discussion of multiple data sources and ways of extracting high-quality data for network analysis. Professor Marra also discussed the pros/cons of various techniques and presented graphical illustrations and an overview of available software for network analysis.

Session 4: Emerging market research: Design, data, and methodology

The last quantitative session was led by Professor Dikova, who returned to the topic of complexity in IB by surveying existing research on the multinationality-performance relationship and focusing on the weaknesses in existing research. Professor Dikova then focused on emerging market multinational companies and data while discussing both theory and meta-analytical techniques to gain a systematic quantitative understanding of the

literature. She next provided an example and ended up tying the various aspects together by introducing QCA as a way of dealing with multiple causal pathways and, hence, complexity in IB.

EIBA 2024 Contributions to Methodology



The Power of Reflexive Contextualization in International Business Research

C. N. Kom, D. R. Sharpe (Sheffield Hallam University)

Abstract: This paper considers the potential of reflexive contextualization methodologies to support research addressing some of the grand challenges in international business research. Whilst discussions on the significance of reflexivity in social science research have taken place in numerous disciplines, it is relatively recent in International Business literature. It is a significant methodological discussion as reflexivity has been characterized as iterative, inclusive, and globally regarded as an indicator of quality in the conduct and reporting of qualitative research that can enhance the societal impact of the field of International Business. This paper begins by examining the concepts of reflexivity and reflexive contextualization, as used in the literature. It discusses how reflexivity and reflexive contextualization can be relevant for research in IB and the opportunities that reflexive contextualization can present to the researcher in IB. Drawing on empirical examples from fieldwork, the paper looks at how reflexive contextualization can be achieved. It contributes a framework for qualitative International Business researchers to address their subjectivity and consciously navigate shifting identities, interactions, and the multifaceted context of the research phenomenon.

Two Paradigms in Dialogue: A Case Study Example from the International Business Field

A. Pallás-Rocaful (University of Valencia), G. Galizzi (University of Vienna), A. Botella-Andreu (University of Valencia)

Despite its potential for theorizing, qualitative research has often been criticized for a lack of rigor. As such, researchers have attempted to increase the legitimacy of qualitative research, in particular case study research, by developing and applying templates. In so doing, qualitative scholars have sometimes applied templates with little to no reflection about ontological and epistemological orientations. As a result, the uniqueness of qualitative research and paradigmatic diversity has been jeopardized. In this methodological paper, we use an empirical case study example from the International Business (IB) field to showcase how different philosophical paradigms lead to different methodological decisions. First, we describe in greater detail the methodological steps undertaken under positivist assumptions, and then we provide an initial overview of the application of a social constructivist view to the same case study by highlighting the differences between the two opposing approaches. In doing so, we aim to warn qualitative researchers about the blind use of qualitative "boilerplates," and we call for greater pluralism in case study research in IB studies.

The IB Researcher as Translator: Methodological Challenges and Opportunities for Advancing Rigor

M. T. Khan (Sheffield Hallam University), N. V. Wilmot (University of Lincoln), F. Darabi (Bangor University), D. R. Sharpe (Sheffield Hallam University)

This paper aims to highlight the challenges associated with the agency required from the IB researcher to make decisions related to translation of data, in particular when moving between languages using different alphabets. We argue that translation is a value laden process where the translator has an agentic role, making decisions in the translation process that need to be unpacked and made transparent to achieve methodological rigor. We draw on an empirical study carried out in the Urdu language in Pakistan to highlight the methodological challenges and opportunities in transcription and translation between languages. We highlight a particularly unexplored implication of translation within the management literature as being the very act of transcription itself, which is a first step in transforming data from the oral to the written, and demonstrate how choices made by the researcher at this stage can influence the entire analytical process. Building on this experience, the paper presents a framework to guide IB researchers dealing with multilingual data, particularly as it relates to transcription and translation processes. Furthermore, we discuss how such a framework provides a space in which to break open broader epistemological questions about how translation decisions affect our knowledge production processes.

Keeping the Conversation Alive: The Use of Mind Maps for Multiple Case Study Analysis

M. A. Pineda-Escobar (ISS - Erasmus University Rotterdam; Politecnico Grancolombiano)

This poster shares a fresh methodological proposal for conducting multiple case study analysis in management research, incorporating the use of abduction and mind maps. Case studies are vastly used in management research, with Eisenhardt and Yin regarded as the two dominant authorities. While their works have contributed significantly to positioning the case study as a legitimate approach, critical scholars have noted limitations to their propositions by being positivist and linear and thus serving only one type of case study research. Another pitfall is that case researchers have sometimes turned to the mechanistic implementation of a technique with concrete procedures or templates. Being wary of this trend and acknowledging the contextual richness of case studies, I propose one alternative method that incorporates an abductive approach to the analysis of case study evidence, to conduct within-case and cross-case analysis with the use of recordings and mind maps. It allows keeping two conversations active and alive for a longer period. First, the use of recordings during analysis keeps the dialogue between researcher and participants alive, bringing the former back to the instance in which that conversation took place. Second, an abductive reasoning approach enables an active conversation between theory and empirical evidence.

See more on: <https://eiba2024.eiba.org/program/>

Upcoming Qual+ Events

Qual+ Workshop | Computer-aided qualitative data analysis in the GenAI era by Prof. Catherine Welch

We are excited to invite you to an insightful workshop by Prof. Catherine Welch (Trinity College, Qual+ International Advisory Board Member), exploring qualitative research in the GenAI era. As AI systems integrate into our daily lives and research processes, this workshop provides a valuable opportunity to pause and critically reflect on their use in qualitative research.

About the Workshop: Researchers, engineers, and entrepreneurs are enthusiastically exploring – and monetising – ways in which generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) tools can be used for qualitative data analysis. From promises of automated coding and thematic analysis, to the development of virtual research assistants to support researchers in interpretive and analytical tasks, the potential applications of GenAI to qualitative research appear promising. In this workshop, we will cover the emerging ‘QualAI’ ecosystem for qualitative data analysis. We will critically assess the offerings that are available, and go beyond the hype and claims being made to assess whether GenAI has any meaningful role to play as a tool for qualitative data analysis in management research. Addressing this

question allows us to ask a more fundamental question: what is qualitative data analysis, really? We conclude the session by reinforcing the interpretive essence of qualitative data analysis.

Date: 17 February 2025

Time: 12:30 – 14:00

Location: Ekonominaukio 1, T004

We hope to see you at the workshop and explore this fascinating topic together!

Featured Courses

Truth Claims: Ontology in Management Research

This Nordic PhD course (supported by NFF) grew out of a very stimulating EGOS subtheme-session in Milan 2024 and is run from the Stockholm School of Economics.

For detailed information see:

[PhD145 - Truth Claims: Ontology in Management Research - Stockholm School of Economics](https://pcw.hhs.se/course/phd145)
<https://pcw.hhs.se/course/phd145>

We explain a little more if you click on our short video,

<https://sse.instructuremedia.com/embed/7fdbd1ab-382f-4335-a216-e9d589713538>

Mark your application ONTOLOGY and post it to Pierre: pgm@hhs.se; so looking forward to hearing from you / Rasmus Nykvist (LiU) and Pierre Guillet de Monthoux (SSE)

Kataja course 'Feminist Theories and Organization Studies: Dialogue on New

Time and place: June 2025 (4.-6.6.2025), University of Lapland, Pyhäntunturi

Link to Kataja course page and registration information: [Feminist Theories and Organization Studies: Dialogue on New Bases - Kataja](#)

Learning goal and objectives: This course focuses on contemporary feminist theoretical debates in the field of organization and management studies. The aim is to enable students to develop a critical appreciation of different feminist approaches to the study of organization, organizing and social relations at work. During the course, central feminist theories will be scrutinized to see how they theorize power differences and are able to reveal different forms of discrimination and processes of inclusion and exclusion, as well as offer emancipatory possibilities for change in contemporary organizations. To address and challenge inequalities in organizations students will be acquainted with new theorizing on

connections between contemporary feminisms and different forms of ethics, including moralities, which are based on affective solidarity, ethics of care and recognition-based ethics.

Instructors:

Alison Pullen Professor of Gender, Work and Organization, Macquarie University, Australia.

As a feminist researcher, Alison has worked with feminist philosophy and methodologies to disrupt dominant institutional norms (including knowledge practices) and explore alternative ways of living.

Susan Meriläinen, Professor of Management, University of Lapland, Finland.

Susan is an organization studies scholar whose current projects relate to the embodied and material aspects of feminist knowledge production practices.

Guest lecturers: Adjunct professor, University lecturer Pikka-Maaria Laine, University of Lapland; Professor Janne Tienari, Hanken; Professor Anu Valtonen, University of Lapland
Course coordinator and contact information: ilmarimiettunen@gmail.com

Sign Up for Updates and Announcements

Qual+ newsletter is published quarterly. If you come across new interesting articles or books, calls for special issues or edited volumes, or are organizing an event or course related to qualitative, mixed, or merged methods, please contact [Emre Can Gulay](#), Qual+ Coordinator. We would happily include this information in future issues and share it with the international Qual+ community.

You can sign up for this newsletter via the web form at the bottom of our website:
[Qual+ | Aalto University](#)