

Chapter 14 (Metasynthesis) additional resources:

Hoon, C. (2013) Meta-synthesis of qualitative case studies: An approach to theory building, *Organizational Research Methods*, 16 (4): 522-556.

This paper is concerned with how qualitative metasynthesis can be used to develop theory. Although theory-building is one of the goals of metasynthesis research, the precise process by which a new theory can be developed is rarely addressed in the literature. This paper is an exception in that it presents an 8-step process designed to generate theory by synthesizing the findings from a set of primary case studies. The paper illustrates this process with reference to a metasynthesis study addressing the question 'How and why do managerial cognitive representations shape the development of dynamic capabilities?'.

Thorne, S., Jensen, L., Kearney, M.H., Noblit, G. and Sandelowski, M. (2004) Qualitative metasynthesis: Reflections on methodological orientation and ideological agenda, *Qualitative Health Research*, 14(10): 1342-1365.

This paper addresses the question of what type of knowledge a metasynthesis can, and cannot, produce. The paper's five authors (each of whom has developed a distinctive qualitative metasynthesis strategy) offer their reflections on how metasynthesis as a method of qualitative analysis generates insights that cannot be gained on the basis of single studies without relying on simplistic generalisations. As such, this paper offers an in-depth conceptual-level exploration of metasynthesis as a qualitative method of analysis, and its relationship with theorising, interpretation, and generalisation.

Weed, M. (2005) 'Meta interpretation': A method for the interpretive synthesis of qualitative research, *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung/ Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 6 (1): 1-16, Art.37, Jan 2005.

This paper offers reflections on the role of interpretation in synthesising qualitative studies. The author reviews and evaluates different approaches to synthesising qualitative research and draws out their key features, paying particular attention to the way in which they go about pulling together primary studies. A distinction is made between aggregative and non-aggregative approaches, and the argument is developed that a synthesis of primary studies ought to be more than the sum of its parts. To achieve this aim, the author sketches out a meta-interpretation approach to metasynthesis.