

## Qualitative Data Analysis

### Challenges:

- To make sense of massive amounts of data
- To reduce the volume of information
- To identify significant patterns
- To construct a framework to communicate what the data reveals

## Transcription

- Verbatim (“word for word”)
- Selective

Importance of an annotation system – to ensure accuracy in transcription work

## Example

I: Where did you meet him?

P: Hmm...let me think...I went to the park and then I saw him [pause] [laughter]. He was wearing a strange outfit [laughter] (inaudible segment for 5 seconds)

## Techniques of Qualitative Analysis

- Content Analysis
- Grounded Theory
- Thematic Analysis
- Inductive/Deductive/Mixed
- Narrative Analysis
- Profiling
- Discourse Analysis

## Coding

- What does this item of data represent?
- Of what topic is this item of data an instance?
- What sort of answer to a question about a topic does this item of data imply?
- What is happening here?
- What are people doing?
- What do people say they are doing?
- What kind of event is going on?

## Coding

- Open coding
- Axial coding
- Selective coding

Grounded Theory

- Pre-set or *a priori* codes vs. emergent codes

Codes/Categories → Themes/Overarching Themes  
 Convergence & Divergence  
 Case Analysis and Cross-Case Analysis

## Example

**REACTION**

It was really good. There was a variety of activities, the overhead and information where they talked about it, and the opportunity to practice the activities together. I liked it. The 5 hours went really quickly. We had a good group, and felt very comfortable because everyone was open and sharing. And the lunch was wonderful. Having lunch was a good idea.

*(Handwritten notes from the transcription)*

- **STRUCTURE ACTIVITIES**
- **COMFORT LEVEL**
- **STRUCTURE VARIETY**
- **SOCIAL NETWORKING**

Yes, the structure helped my grasp the information, and I enjoyed the group size and variety of activities. 5.5 hours was good enough, and it went quickly. It all seemed to follow their outline, and it gave the opportunity to listen and then practice and get to know other people, because I was there by myself.

*(Handwritten notes from the transcription)*

- **FACE-TO-FACE VS REMOTE**
- **ONSITE IMPACT**

I think I would have gotten the same information either way with the overheads and printouts, but the interpersonal and opportunity to relate to other people and have back and forth and the ability to ask questions was more personal and enjoyable. In a webinar, I don't feel comfortable asking questions to someone I don't know, so the personal, face to face was better than if I did the webinar. I imagine I would have gotten the same information, but it wouldn't have been as enjoyable, and without the activities and other people's questions, I probably wouldn't remember as much.

*(Handwritten notes from the transcription)*

1. What was your overall impression of the training in terms of its usefulness to your work?

**REACTION**

It is great because I do survey development and work with people that develop surveys. It was really helpful. Afterward, I analyzed surveys and it made me wish I had attended the training before, because now I know there's better ways to do it. Yes, it has definitely met my expectations.

*(Handwritten notes from the transcription)*

- **EXPECTANCY**

## Validity (Constructivist View)

- Repeatability is suspect:
  - Reality is “multiple and constructed”, same situation can never recur
  - Researcher objectivity is unattainable
  - E.g. successful replication depends on tacit knowledge
- Focus instead on “trustworthiness”:
  - Credibility of researchers and results
  - Transferability of findings
  - Dependability - results are robust across a range of situations
  - Confirmability
- Identify strategies to increase trustworthiness...

## Strategies for constructivists

- Triangulation
  - Different sources of data used to confirm findings
- Member checking
  - Research participants confirm that results make sense from their perspective
- Rich, thick descriptions
  - As much detail as possible on the setting and the data collected
- Clarify bias
  - Be honest about researcher's bias
  - Self-reflection when reporting findings
- Report discrepant information
  - Include data that contradicts findings as well as that which confirms
- Prolonged contact with participants
  - Spend long enough to ensure researcher really understands the situation being studied
- Peer debriefing
  - A colleague critically reviews the study and tests assumptions
- External Auditor
  - Independent expert reviews procedures and findings

50

