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What is your struggle?

• How many of you feel you have the resources you need to successfully conduct, analyze and publish a qualitative study?

• What resources are missing?

• Is there a method you wish you were using?

• What are you interested in learning about qualitative methods?
Where are we?

- Qualitative data is becoming increasingly accepted and in some cases required in many fields of research.

- Typically, “qualitative research” still means a thematic analysis of survey data or open-ended interviews with human subjects. But this is just a small part of what qualitative methods are about.

- New qualitative methods continue to emerge so don’t feel constrained or married to open ended surveys or interviews or to “thematic analysis.”

- New methods for analysis, techniques and software also continue to emerge.

- Because of the internet – blogs, comments, etc. – data are EVERYWHERE!

- Validity and rigor in qualitative data is still under debate due to naiveté about qualitative inquiry by reviewers, etc.
Where are we? - Barriers

Bias/Bracketing

Inter-rater reliability façade

Quantifying our qualitative – sometimes this is necessary, but beware of the 3 C’s – counting, comparing, and control as these are not congruent with a qualitative method

Most common question I get for a qualitative study, “How many people do I need to have a large enough group (aka enough power)?”
New Methods

- Lots of new methods are emerging as a result of the enormous amount of internet data (free for the analyzing)

- Lots of new techniques using technology - use of a data clicker to get immediate, anonymous data from a group, mobile phone data collection, real time data, internet, etc.

- And lots of methods are emerging that include other media than text - photo voice, art-based inquiry, video analysis, and many, many more...
Highlighting a Few New Methods

- Art-based Inquiry
- Glaserian Grounded Theory
- Metaphorical Analysis
- Participatory Action – Expansion into Community Based Action
Grounded Theory Basics

- What is the problem, how are the participants trying to solve it?

- The goal is a reverse engineered, grounded hypothesis, grass-roots.

- GT is not a descriptive technique, instead the goal is the generation of theory that explain the phenomena and it’s attempted resolution.
Glaserian Grounded Theory

- **Emergence** versus forcing of the data
- Produces a **rooted** hypothesis
- General/conceptual versus descriptive
- **Everything** is data
- Relevant, fit, **modifiable**, workable
Glaserian Grounded Theory

- The use of Straussian “coding paradigms” (forced step by step) constricts the emergent GT process for the sake of a more “valid” system.

- GT is not a Qualitative Data Analysis (QDA), it is concerned with conceptualization devoid of time, place, or person. GT is not limited to qualitative data or context.

- An iterative process in which all data is compared to each other as the theory emerges.

- All is data! – interview, observations, statistical, and media data are all used to inform a substantive area.
A New Technique for Collaboration: Hidden Swap

- When collaborating with another researcher, we often get stuck on *how* to conduct analysis and we worry about influencing one another and the data.

- First, remember in qualitative we hold the assumption of bias and influence. We ARE part of the data, like it or not, so really these concerns are against the foundation of qualitative.

- However, we want to get the most of the data, thus, we may want to work alone in analysis and then share our ideas without closing out another researchers ideas. Here is a technique to do that:
A New Technique for Collaboration: Hidden Swap

- Researcher 1 Codes Salient Data
- Full team reviews all the data including all codes and memos from each researcher
- Researcher 1 removes codes but leaves excerpts in clusters
- Salient Data Emerges
- Researchers 2 & 3 review excerpt families and create their own codes or descriptors
- Full team reviews all the data including all codes and memos from each researcher
Why use software?

- Qualitative data is often large
- Collaborating in data management and analysis can be complex
- Paper (even computer files) can easily be lost or inaccessible
- Tracking the qualitative process can be difficult
Why Dedoose

- Lots of qualitative software exists
  - N-Vivo (paid)
  - Atlas-ti (paid)
  - HyperResearch (paid)
  - C.A.T. (open source, but no support)

- Dedoose allows for somewhat natural, documented collaboration.

- Dedoose is web-based, so your notes, files and analyses are all in one place, accessible by multiple people.
Dedoose
# Dedoose

## Active Excerpts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selected</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Codes Short</th>
<th>Father work status</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Child Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.22 Pre</td>
<td>442</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reading by Others...</td>
<td>Full Time</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19.14 Pre</td>
<td>308</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reading by Others...</td>
<td>Full Time</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.26 Pre</td>
<td>1066</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-Writing Activities...</td>
<td>Full Time</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.27 Pre</td>
<td>578</td>
<td></td>
<td>Letter Recognition:</td>
<td>Full Time</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.26 Pre</td>
<td>1195</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reading by Primaries...</td>
<td>Full Time</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.27 Pre</td>
<td>707</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reading by Others...</td>
<td>Full Time</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21.1 Post</td>
<td>445</td>
<td></td>
<td>School Prep Beliefs...</td>
<td>Full Time</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19.14 Pre</td>
<td>713</td>
<td></td>
<td>School Prep Beliefs...</td>
<td>Full Time</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.26 Pre</td>
<td>376</td>
<td></td>
<td>Parent-Child Talk...</td>
<td>Full Time</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.18 Pre</td>
<td>577</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-Writing Activities...</td>
<td>Full Time</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.18 Post</td>
<td>1564</td>
<td></td>
<td>School Prep Beliefs...</td>
<td>Full Time</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19.14 Post</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reading by Primaries...</td>
<td>Full Time</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.26 Pre</td>
<td>1510</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reading by Others...</td>
<td>Full Time</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.27 Post</td>
<td>580</td>
<td></td>
<td>Letter Recognition:</td>
<td>Full Time</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21.06 Pre</td>
<td>926</td>
<td></td>
<td>School Prep Beliefs...</td>
<td>Full Time</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.25 Pre</td>
<td>356</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-Writing Activities...</td>
<td>Full Time</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21.15 Pre</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>Interviewer sees the drawings and writing and her reaction is positive, praising child</td>
<td>Full Time</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.22 Pre</td>
<td>380</td>
<td></td>
<td>2x week plays writing letters. Plays with...</td>
<td>Full Time</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21.1 Post</td>
<td>1446</td>
<td></td>
<td>Coloring books every day. She spends about 30 minutes in his activity</td>
<td>Full Time</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Filtering

- Full Time
- Part Time
- Ethnicity:
  - (Blank)
  - African American
  - Hispanic
- Child Gender:
  - Female
  - Male

### Codes

- Read 10.18 Pre: Child likes to paint, uses lots of colors, with father and mom. Parents seem to participate and enjoy this activity.
- Letter Recognition: Child can write her name. Writes letter and pretends they are real words.
- Pre-Writing Activities... Interviewer sees the drawings and writing and her reaction is positive, praising child
- School Prep Beliefs... 2x week plays writing letters. Plays with coloring books every day. She spends about 30 minutes in his activity
My Experience with Dedoose

- The pros:
  - Good customer support
  - Great tutorials, easy start-up for students and faculty
  - Easy collaboration

- The Cons:
  - Hard to share models or network key codes (Atlas-ti is great at this)
  - Built for quantitative and qualitative work, so true qualitative work, must ignore some of the quantitative structure (e.g. counting codes)
Qualitative Resources

FQS is a peer-reviewed multilingual online journal for qualitative research established in 1999.
http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/index

The TQR Community of Nova Southeastern University publishes The Qualitative Report, a peer-reviewed, weekly open access journal. Subscription to TQR is free-of-charge.
http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/

Dedoose is a cross-platform app for analyzing text, video, and spreadsheet data (analyzing qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods research).
www.dedoose.com

International Institute for Qualitative Methodology
http://www.iiqm.ualberta.ca/