



## Peer Review Report


### PEER REVIEW REPORT FOR:

Behling, G., Lenzi, F. C., & Rossetto, C. R. (2022). Upcoming issues, new methods: Using interactive qualitative analysis (IQA) in management research. *Revista de Administração Contemporânea*, 26(4), e200417. <https://doi.org/10.1590/1982-7849rac2022200417.en>

### HOW TO CITE THIS PEER REVIEW REPORT:

Behling, G., Lenzi, F. C., Rossetto, C. R., & Campana, C. (2022). Peer review report for: Upcoming issues, new methods: Using interactive qualitative analysis (IQA) in management research. RAC. *Revista de Administração Contemporânea*. *Zenodo*. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5825393>

### REVIEWERS:

 Carla Campana (Fundação Getulio Vargas, EAESP, Brazil)  
*And one anonymous reviewer.*

## ROUND 1

### Reviewer 1 report

*Reviewer 1 for this round chose not to disclose his/her review report.*

### Authors' Responses

Dear Editor-in-Chief, Associate Editors and Reviewer,

We submitted a revised version of our paper "Upcoming issues, new methods: using Interactive Qualitative Analysis (IQA) in Management Research"

We would like to thank you for your excellent contributions and efforts dedicated to our work. We hope that the new version shows improvement in our paper. We agreed to your suggestions and improved the article accordingly.

In the table below we present the changes for each request. We also submitted a version using track changes of Microsoft Word and

an unmarked version.

We remain available for any further suggestions you may have.

Sincerely,

The Authors

*The authors' responses to the comments of Reviewer 1 for this round were omitted from this report, since the reviewer did not authorize the disclosure of his/her report.*

## ROUND 2

### Reviewer 1 report

*Reviewer 1 for this round chose not to disclose his/her review report.*

### Reviewer 2 report

Reviewer: Carla Campana

Date review returned: July 07, 2021

Recommendation: Minor Revision

#### Comments to the authors

Dear authors

Thank you for the opportunity to read and review your paper. I found the theme relevant and the contribution appropriate to the administration field. In order to contribute to your work, please consider the review below.

Page 9, line 43 – 48

Check the use of “evidenced” and “evidence” in the passage, it sounds redundant.

Page 10, line 14 – 16

You say: “The discovery of the new and the theorization in Administration research require the use of inductive methods.” Wouldn't the use of “require” excessive? It seems more adequate something more related to “contribute” or “benefit”.

Page 10, line 17 – Page 11, line 18

I suggest you have the examples shorter, evidencing the differential of the qualitative approach for those specific research questions.

Page 11, line 7 – 9

Review the duplicated use of “seven supply chains”; it seems redundant.

Page 11, line 36

You say: “Qualitative methods are beneficial for the emergence of new phenomena”. Do you mean: Qualitative research methods are beneficial to understand the emergence of new phenomena?

Page 12, after line 54

I strongly suggest you present a view of the recent studies using IQA; and do the same, specifically, for the management field. If there's any, it's important that it's mentioned – in order to better position your study. If there's not, the information can make your study stronger.

Page 12, line 12 – 14

You say: “the development of an emerging theory capable of supporting research in related environments (Godoy & Brunstein, 2020).” I struggled to understand this sentence. Which environment? Related to what? And I also couldn't find the reference on the reference list. Please, check all of them to make sure they are all listed.

Page 12, line 18

“2011).Langley” – a space is missing.

Page 13, line 27 – 36

You may want to mention a reference to support this paragraph.

Page 13, line 49

I couldn't understand this sentence: “can also generate individual maps or different groups”. What groups? Different of what?

Page 13, line 54 – 56

You say: “The protocol for data collection and analysis makes it possible to minimize the researcher's involvement in the initial moments”. I can understand the main idea, but reading the procedures that you describe I noticed a strong researcher's involvement in the initial steps. For instance: defining the research question, selecting the participants, providing a framework, giving the instructions, offering the incentive phrases, provoking. I suggest you rephrase trying to be more specific about what you called involvement.

Page 14, line 10 – 14

It looks excessive affirm that “the premises of qualitative research is that the participants' role is to generate data and that only the researcher is qualified to analyze it (Bargate, 2014, Davis, 2019).”. Also, there are some approaches more open to the participants active role, see Action Research, for instance, and there are others too.

I also found this excerpt (“premises of qualitative research, suggesting that the participants' role is to generate data and that only the researcher is qualified to analyze it (Bargate, 2014, Davis, 2019)”) rather similar to Bargate 2014, p. 12. I suggest you make it a direct quotation or rephrase it. Please, double-check for other occurrences like that.

Page 16, line 48 – 50

How to know if an individual acts like an “owner of reason” or is “shy”? Is a pre-selection required? It would be good to have more details about that.

Page 16, line 58 – 60

I got concerned by knowing that your research group was smaller than the authors' recommendation. Can you provide more details explaining the group selection and if or how you avoid the effect predicted by Northcutt & McCoy (2004) when using smaller groups? Since you aim to present IQA as a valuable research strategy in the administration field an example following the standards seems to be more appropriate.

Page 18, line 24 – 26

Review to avoid repeating in a short excerpt: reflect, reflections, reflecting.

Page 19, line 51

Make sure to ask for the proper authorization to reproduce the image.

Page 20, line 38

Do you mean affinities instead of categories? I can't recall reading categories before.

Page 20, line 42

Do you mean “unlike the previous step” instead of “unlike the other steps”?

Page 23, line 7

I suggest you use a pattern to write the numerals; in this line, “1” seems better than “one”. There are other occurrences.

Page 23, line 55

I suggest you use a pattern for capital letters in the column names.

Page 28, line 10 – figure

In my file, the image appears to be incomplete. The labels are partially covering the circles.

Page 29, line 53

Check the bold mark in “Uncluttered SID”.

Page 31, line 16 – 20

The two sentences appear to be redundant.

Page 34, line 37 – 50

You may want to mention a reference to support this paragraph.

Page 37, line 60

Make sure to ask for the proper authorization to reproduce the image.

Page 39, line 7 – 14

I strongly recommend you rethink this excerpt: “the present study contributes without aiming to exhaust the discussions about it, nor does it become a guide for the application of the method, which has several unreported application variables and details to be considered in its planning, execution, analysis, and publication that evidently could not be exhausted in this work.” I understand that the method can’t be exhausted in a paper, but your article seems to fit in the topic pointed out on the call for papers: “step by step application of specific research methods” – since your objective was to detail a method application.

I also have two general considerations:

I found just three articles reporting research based on IQA in your reference list. It seems to me that it could be an opportunity to enrich the work with more examples, relations and references, as I suggested in the introduction.

I also suggest you try to establish a dialog between your work and previous papers from RAC. I listed some non-exhaustive suggestions below for your consideration.

Lima, L. G. de, Nassif, V. M. J., & Garçon, M. M. (2020). O Poder do Capital Psicológico: A Força das Crenças no Comportamento Empreendedor. *Revista De Administração Contemporânea*, 24(4), 317-334. <https://doi.org/10.1590/1982-7849rac2020180226>

Souza Neto, R. A. de, Dias, G. F., Silva, R. R. da, & Ramos, A. S. M. (2019). Efeitos dos Softwares de Análise de Dados Qualitativos na Qualidade de Pesquisas. *Revista De Administração Contemporânea*, 23(3), 373-394. <https://doi.org/10.1590/1982-7849rac2019170357>

Vieira, V. A., & Tibola, F. (1). Pesquisa qualitativa em marketing e suas variações: trilhas para pesquisas futuras. *Revista De Administração Contemporânea*, 9(2), 9-33. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S1415-65552005000200002>

#### Additional Questions:

Does the manuscript contain new and significant information to justify publication?: Yes

Does the Abstract (Summary) clearly and accurately describe the content of the article?: Yes

Is the problem significant and concisely stated?: Yes

Are the methods described comprehensively?: Yes

Are the interpretations and conclusions justified by the results?: Yes

Is adequate reference made to other work in the field?: No

Is the language acceptable?: Yes

Does the article have data and / or materials that could be made publicly available by the authors?: Yes

Please state any conflict(s) of interest that you have in relation to the review of this paper (state “none” if this is not applicable).: None

Rating:

Interest: 2. Good

Quality: 3. Average

Originality: 2. Good

Overall: 3. Average

## Authors' Responses

Dear Editor-in-Chief, Associate Editors and Reviewers,

We appreciate the conditional acceptance of our work and reviewers' new contributions and suggestions.

We submitted a revised version of our paper "Upcoming issues, new methods: using Interactive Qualitative Analysis (IQA) in Management Research" and we would like to thank you for your excellent contributions and efforts dedicated to our work. We hope that the new version shows improvements and complies with your requirements.

Our data, codes, and step-by-step procedures have been deposited in Mendeley Data, according to your request (doi: 10.17632/kb76h5jtvw.1).

In the table below we present the changes for each request. The track changes of Microsoft Word of the previous version were kept and we highlighted in blue the changes of this new version to facilitate your review. We also submitted an unmarked file.

Sincerely,

The Authors.

Comments from the Reviewer	Improvements made
<b>Page 9, line 43 – 48</b> Check the use of “evidenced” and “evidence” in the passage, it sounds redundant.	We revised the sentence, eliminating the redundance: <i>Qualitative methods have gained space and recognition in Management Research as essential tools for understanding complex issues and social processes underlying the study of organizations' management, as can be evidenced by the increase in publications that use qualitative approaches in number and quality and the calls for special editions on qualitative research (Arino, LeBaron &amp; Milliken, 2016; Bansal, Smith &amp; Vaara, 2018).</i>
<b>Page 10, line 14 – 16</b> You say: “The discovery of the new and the theorization in Administration research require the use of inductive methods.” Wouldn't the use of “require” excessive? It seems more adequate something more related to “contribute” or “benefit”.	We agreed with reviewer's consideration and rewrote the sentence: <i>The discovery of the new and the theorization in Administration research might be potentiated by the use of inductive methods.</i>
<b>Page 10, line 17 – Page 11, line 18</b> I suggest you have the examples shorter, evidencing the differential of the qualitative approach for those specific research questions.	We reduced the discussion about specificities of each example, focusing on their similarities in terms of research questions (how?) and insufficient theoretical framework that reveals qualitative methods' contribution to generate theory. In addition to abbreviating the examples, we have added this sentence: <i>In both examples, researchers hadn't consistent theoretical previous basis for answering “how” questions and the inductive process developed in theirs works generated frameworks and initial explanations that may be deepened in future studies.</i>
<b>Page 11, line 7 – 9</b> Review the duplicated use of “seven supply chains”; it seems redundant.	Request solved in the previous topic.
<b>Page 11, line 36</b> You say: “Qualitative methods are beneficial for the emergence of new phenomena”. Do you mean: Qualitative research methods are beneficial to understand the emergence of new phenomena?	Yes, this was our intention. We adjusted the sentence for a better understanding: <i>Qualitative methods are beneficial for understanding the emergence of new phenomena (Arino et al., 2016) [...]</i>

Comments from the Reviewer	Improvements made
<p><b>Page 12, after line 54</b></p> <p>I strongly suggest you present a view of the recent studies using IQA; and do the same, specifically, for the management field. If there's any, it's important that it's mentioned – in order to better position your study. If there's not, the information can make your study stronger.</p>	<p>We included three recent studies that used IQA in our discussion. Schreuders-van den Bergh and Du Plessis (2016), du Preez and Stiglingh (2018) and Pugalia, Prakash and Cetindamar (2020). However, there are few works carried out in management field using IQA. We point to this as the main contribution of our work. We also chose not to discuss the particularities of each study, as this would make the introduction exhaustive and detract from the focus of our discussion.</p> <p>We included the following paragraph:</p> <p><i>“Although IQA has been widely used in areas such as education (Bargate, 2014), few studies have used the method in business research. Works of Schreuders-van den Bergh and Du Plessis (2016), Du Preez and Stiglingh (2018) and Pugalia, Prakash and Cetindamar (2020) are examples of IQA application that were published in management journals. Considering the relevance of new qualitative methods added to the IQA's adherence to the research problems of the management field, the main contribution of this article is to present IQA as a methodological alternative for the field, as well as in the communication of its techniques and procedures, aiming to contribute to its greater use by researchers.”</i></p>
<p><b>Page 12, line 12 – 14</b></p> <p>You say: “the development of an emerging theory capable of supporting research in related environments (Godoy &amp; Brunstein, 2020).” I struggled to understand this sentence. Which environment? Related to what? And I also couldn't find the reference on the reference list. Please, check all of them to make sure they are all listed.</p>	<p>We adjusted the text to improve the understanding.</p> <p>In this quote, we refer to Godoy and Brunstein (2020) who termed “recontextualization” as the qualitative researcher's cognitive process of generating an emergent theory that could support the development of new research in similar contexts.</p> <p>We also corrected the reference list.</p> <p>The paragraph adjusted:</p> <p><i>The importance of procedures that promote qualitative studies' credibility is highlighted by adopting more explicit criteria and processes, which enable the understanding and replication of researchers in other contexts (Abadalla, Oliveira, Azevedo &amp; Gonzalez, 2018), promoting the process of recontextualization, which according to Godoy and Brunstein (2020), consists of the possibility of new findings (an emerging theory) being applied in other contexts and realities, contributing to the advancement of the field. Therefore, the manifest conceptions of good research practice will generate external credibility and legitimization for qualitative studies (Paiva Júnior, Souza Leão &amp; Mello, 2011) and many authors have dedicated themselves to studying the quality of qualitative research, manifested in its capacity to meet the criteria established by the academic community (Souza Neto, Dias, Silva &amp; Ramos, 2019).</i></p>
<p><b>Page 12, line 18</b></p> <p>“2011).Langley” – a space is missing.</p>	<p>We adjusted.</p>
<p><b>Page 13, line 27 – 36</b></p> <p>You may want to mention a reference to support this paragraph.</p>	<p>We included Northcutt and McCoy (2004) reference.</p>
<p><b>Page 13, line 49</b></p> <p>I couldn't understand this sentence: “can also generate individual maps or different groups”. What groups? Different of what?</p>	<p>We adjusted the phrase.</p>
<p><b>Page 13, line 54 – 56</b></p> <p>You say: “The protocol for data collection and analysis makes it possible to minimize the researcher's involvement in the initial moments”. I can understand the main idea, but reading the procedures that you describe I noticed a strong researcher's involvement in the initial steps. For instance: defining the research question, selecting the participants, providing a framework, giving the instructions, offering the incentive phrases, provoking. I suggest you rephrase trying to be more specific about what you called involvement.</p>	<p>The minimization of researcher involvement that Northcutt and McCoy (2004) refer to is in the collection stages - participants generate the data themselves; and analysis - participants create the categories, called in IQA affinities and not in the research planning stages that are, in fact, all conducted by the researcher.</p> <p>We adjusted the phrase for better understanding.</p> <p><i>The IQA protocol for data collection and analysis makes it possible to minimize the researcher's involvement in the initial moments of data collection and analysis, giving the research participants a high degree of freedom to, within the framework provided, carry out the first steps of data analysis, organizing their speech into categories and analyzing the relationships between them. The researcher's role becomes that of a research facilitator, causing participants to generate and analyze their data, with minimal external influence (Northcutt &amp; McCoy, 2004).</i></p>

Comments from the Reviewer	Improvements made
<p><b>Page 14, line 10 – 14</b></p> <p>It looks excessive affirm that “the premises of qualitative research is that the participants’ role is to generate data and that only the researcher is qualified to analyze it (Bargate, 2014, Davis, 2019).”. Also, there are some approaches more open to the participants active role, see Action Research, for instance, and there are others too.</p> <p>I also found this excerpt (“premises of qualitative research, suggesting that the participants’ role is to generate data and that only the researcher is qualified to analyze it (Bargate, 2014, Davis, 2019)”) rather similar to Bargate 2014, p. 12. I suggest you make it a direct quotation or rephrase it. Please, double-check for other occurrences like that.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. We have changed the text to use a direct quote in the indicated sentence.</p> <p>We also disaggregate contributions from Bargate (2014) and Davis (2019). In addition, we complemented the paragraph with as Davis (2019) mentions that the IQA protocol promotes research rigor.</p> <p>The paragraph adjusted:</p> <p><i>With this logic, “IQA challenges the traditional assumptions of qualitative research which suggest that the role of participants is to generate data, which only the researcher is qualified to analyse” (Bargate, 2014, p. 12).</i></p> <p><i>Participants generate, analyze, and interpret their own data and the researcher guides them through the process. This is a mean to promote trustworthiness, dependability and confirmability in qualitative research, thereby assuring its rigor (Davis, 2019).</i></p>
<p><b>Page 16, line 48 – 50</b></p> <p>How to know if an individual acts like an “owner of reason” or is “shy”? Is a pre-selection required? It would be good to have more details about that.</p>	<p>This recommendation is made by Northcutt and McCoy (2004), without, however, explaining further details.</p> <p>In our research, there was a year of planning for the choice of participants, so the knowledge of their characteristics and the sensitivity of the researchers is important in determining intentional choice. We have added this sentence to the text:</p>
<p><b>Page 16, line 58 – 60</b></p> <p>I got concerned by knowing that your research group was smaller than the authors’ recommendation. Can you provide more details explaining the group selection and if or how you avoid the effect predicted by Northcutt &amp; McCoy (2004) when using smaller groups? Since you aim to present IQA as a valuable research strategy in the administration field an example following the standards seems to be more appropriate.</p>	<p>Although Northcutt and McCoy (2004) recommend groups of 12 to 20 participants, the authors themselves cite that focus groups for other methods are generally conducted with 8 to 10 participants and that this can be applied in IQA. The authors argue that smaller groups can be conducted as long as the number of cards and affinities generated is sufficient for the analyses, which occurred in our research. A remark about this (for both focus group and number of affinities) was already included in the text, so we chose not to modify it.</p>
<p><b>Page 18, line 24 – 26</b></p> <p>Review to avoid repeating in a short excerpt: reflect, reflections, reflecting.</p>	<p>We adjusted the paragraph:</p> <p><i>The researcher encourages constituents to recall what thoughts, reflections, memories come to mind when they think of the guiding question. Constituents are asked to write their experiences on cards placed on the tables, a single thought per card, giving preference to words or short phrases.</i></p>
<p><b>Page 19, line 51</b></p> <p>Make sure to ask for the proper authorization to reproduce the image.</p>	<p>We quoted the images, included the book in reference list and will contact Sage Publications for formal authorization.</p>
<p><b>Page 20, line 38</b></p> <p>Do you mean affinities instead of categories? I can’t recall reading categories before.</p>	<p>Text adjusted.</p>
<p><b>Page 20, line 42</b></p> <p>Do you mean “unlike the previous step” instead of “unlike the other steps”?</p>	<p>No. We use “unlike others” referring to the creation and naming of affinities. But since silent brainstorming is also an individual step, we adjusted the text.</p> <p><i>“Unlike the creation and appointment of the affinities, this step is performed individually and without the participants exchanging information”.</i></p>
<p><b>Page 23, line 7</b></p> <p>I suggest you use a pattern to write the numerals; in this line, “1” seems better than “one”. There are other occurrences.</p>	<p>Text adjusted as suggested.</p> <p><i>Considering the relationship between affinities 1 (demand) and 2 (differentials), for example, one participant stated that affinity 1 influences 2 (direction of arrow →), while eight participants claimed that affinity 2 influences 1 (direction of arrow ←). The cases in which the sum of the relationships did not total nine indicate that one of the participants stated no relationship between the affinities (&lt; &gt;).</i></p>
<p><b>Page 23, line 55</b></p> <p>I suggest you use a pattern for capital letters in the column names.</p>	<p>Text adjusted as suggested.</p>
<p><b>Page 28, line 10 – figure</b></p> <p>In my file, the image appears to be incomplete. The labels are partially covering the circles.</p>	<p>Image adjusted as suggested.</p>



Comments from the Reviewer	Improvements made
<b>Page 29, line 53</b> Check the bold mark in “Uncluttered SID”.	Text adjusted as suggested.
<b>Page 31, line 16 – 20</b> The two sentences appear to be redundant.	Text adjusted as suggested. <i>The first objective of the interviews was to deepen the understanding of the seven affinities defined during the focus group. The interview protocol aimed to obtain a detailed and exemplified description of each affinity from the point of view of the participants' experience.</i>
<b>Page 34, line 37 – 50</b> You may want to mention a reference to support this paragraph.	We referenced Northcutt and McCoy (2004).
<b>Page 37, line 60</b> Make sure to ask for the proper authorization to reproduce the image.	We quoted the images, included the book in reference list and will contact Sage Publications for formal authorization.
<b>Page 39, line 7 – 14</b> I strongly recommend you rethink this excerpt: “the present study contributes without aiming to exhaust the discussions about it, nor does it become a guide for the application of the method, which has several unreported application variables and details to be considered in its planning, execution, analysis, and publication that evidently could not be exhausted in this work.” I understand that the method can't be exhausted in a paper, but your article seems to fit in the topic pointed out on the call for papers: “step by step application of specific research methods” – since your objective was to detail a method application.	<i>We appreciate the suggestion and adjusted the paragraph.</i> <i>By presenting the step-by-step empirical application of the IQA, this study contributes to disseminating and promoting its use in management research. We use the standard IQA procedures, but Northcutt and McCoy (2004) report other less common ways of applying the method that might be more appropriate for other research questions. Therefore, in addition to this guide, we suggest that those interested in the method look for the work of Northcutt and McCoy (2004) in addition to consulting examples of the empirical application detailed in the thesis and dissertations of Harrel (2004), Robertson (2015), and Behling (2019).</i>
I also have two general considerations: I found just three articles reporting research based on IQA in your reference list. It seems to me that it could be an opportunity to enrich the work with more examples, relations and references, as I suggested in the introduction.	We added three new articles as examples of IQA use: Schreuders-van den Bergh and Du Plessis (2016), Du Preez and Stiglingh (2018) and Pugalia, Prakash and Cetindamar (2020). There are few studies that employ IQA in management research, however, these indications demonstrate the method's adherence to research problems in the field. We have chosen not to discuss the articles given the length of the paper and the focus on reporting the step-by-step method.
I also suggest you try to establish a dialog between your work and previous papers from RAC. I listed some non-exhaustive suggestions below for your consideration.  Lima, L. G. de, Nassif, V. M. J., & Garçon, M. M. (2020). O Poder do Capital Psicológico: A Força das Crenças no Comportamento Empreendedor. Revista De Administração Contemporânea, 24(4), 317-334. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1590/1982-7849rac2020180226">https://doi.org/10.1590/1982-7849rac2020180226</a>  Souza Neto, R. A. de, Dias, G. F., Silva, R. R. da, & Ramos, A. S. M. (2019). Efeitos dos Softwares de Análise de Dados Qualitativos na Qualidade de Pesquisas. Revista De Administração Contemporânea, 23(3), 373-394. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1590/1982-7849rac2019170357">https://doi.org/10.1590/1982-7849rac2019170357</a>  Vieira, V. A., & Tibola, F. (1). Pesquisa qualitativa em marketing e suas variações: trilhas para pesquisas futuras. Revista De Administração Contemporânea, 9(2), 9-33. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1590/S1415-65552005000200002">https://doi.org/10.1590/S1415-65552005000200002</a>	We seek to establish a dialogue with the works of Vieira and Tibola (2005) and Souza-Neto, Dias, Silva, and Ramos (2019), as suggested. We also present a gap pointed out by associate editors Lanka, Lanka, Rostron, and Singh (2021), which we judge our work to be aligned with.

Disclaimer: The content of the Peer Review Report is the full copy of reviewers and authors' reports. Typing and punctuation errors are not edited. Only comments that violate the journal's ethical policies such as derogatory or defamatory comments will be edited (omitted) from the report. In these cases, it will be clearly stated that parts of the report were edited. Check [RAC's policies](#).