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Agenda

1. Tools & Content as part of MN/DN
2. Design
3. Data Collection
4. Analysis
5. Results
6. Findings
7. Reliability
8. Summertime at MN/DN
Buy the book and get a year free membership to the site!

Help masters and doctoral students be more productive.

By giving you tools the tools you need 24/7 so you can be completely comfortable throughout your academic process, in skill building and so you can maintain your motivation throughout.
Qualitative Data Collection:
The logic needed to ensure you get what you are seeking

Message:
Solid results and findings start with the researcher planning ahead.
### Overview of Design, Collection and Analysis Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Data Collection Tools</th>
<th>Datapoints Yielded</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Data Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>List each research question (RQ) in a separate row below.</td>
<td>List which instrument(s) are used to collect the data that will address each RQ.</td>
<td>List which specific questions/variables/scales of the instrument will address each RQ.</td>
<td>List which persons/artifacts/records will provide the data.</td>
<td>Briefly describe the specific statistical or qualitative analyses that will address each RQ.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Remember....
Qualitative Analysis is not meant to be linear
IE Just because a person answers your question 1 with X doesn’t mean X is only appropriate to that question.

Think holistically about your data as your goal is to unpack the lived experience of the people you work with as they understand or reference your topic.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Data Collection Tools</th>
<th>Datapoints Yielded</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Data Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. How do gender, socio-economics and culture interact?</td>
<td>Gender and socialization, religion, culture</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Semi structured, In-depth interviews, 2. Focus Groups</td>
<td>Excerpts from data overlapped and differences studied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. What do people see as pressing health needs?</td>
<td>General and specific ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Semi structured, In-depth interviews, 2. Focus Groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. What do they think needs to change to improve HIV %?</td>
<td>Challenges &amp; change, focus for future health promotion model</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Semi structured, In-depth interviews, 2. Focus Groups</td>
<td>Table of responses and changes suggested</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Have your data and you **DIDN’T PLAN AHEAD?**

Message:
It’s never too late.

Go back right now and chart this logic for your study – it will help you right up a cogent story.
Exploiting Rapid Change in Technology
Enhanced Learning…

Part 2: Moving from solid data to results and findings
ORGANIZATION: FIND YOUR THEMES

EXPECT THEM TO CHANGE AS THEY MOVE DOWN THE FUNNEL

- Reading anything even loosely related to what interests you
- General Themes
- Specific Themes
- Gaps To Be Filled By Your Study
Task List for Processing Your Results:

1. Code in such a way as to indicate to which question you think the quotation will apply
2. Compare frequencies between codes (a preliminary result or indication of importance)
3. Do a cross comparison of times X code is related to Y code as preliminary suggestion as to linkages
4. Do #1 then reflect, #2 reflect, #3 reflect then repeat the process and track the iteration of your ideas.
5. Keep a journal of these steps – you may find it helpful to include these in your analysis section in chapter 3
My Personal Favourite
Guba and Lincoln (1986) proposed four criteria for judging the soundness of qualitative research and explicitly offered these as an alternative to more traditional quantitatively-oriented criteria. They felt that their four criteria better reflected the underlying assumptions involved in much qualitative research.

Their proposed criteria and the "analogous" quantitative criteria are listed in the table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traditional Criteria for Judging Quantitative Research</th>
<th>Alternative Criteria for Judging Qualitative Research</th>
<th>Writing Note: You may want to include a discussion of which of these criteria you expect your examiners to be able to judge – this can be included in a reliability and validity section in Chapter 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>internal validity</td>
<td>credibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>external validity</td>
<td>transferability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reliability</td>
<td>dependability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>objectivity</td>
<td>confirmability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Definitions:

1. Credible: We believe it – highly subjective but suitable for a first glance
2. Reliable – was the method of research done with integrity so that we can trust the results (inter rater reliability?) (references are the best, work could be repeated as ideas were questioned until the results were repeated, results were triangulated) = Dependable
3. Replicable – not used in qualitative as it is assumed that different populations will always give us different insights as people are complex and qualitative samples are small and not random = Transferable
4. Valid (internal = credible) – well grounded in logic – sound arguments – the extent to which findings are an accurate representation of the phenomena they represent.
5. Triangulation – testing/comparing/critically analyzing one set of results with another, blending and co-constructing
6. Trustworthy – how rigorously the analysis has been designed/conducted? Transcription? Were the results coded against definitive definitions? Was inter rater reliability used? Were there rounds of collection so previous assumptions could be tested? Were unexpected or conflicting results discussed?

A visual storyboard of an outstanding set up for qualitative findings....

An ontology of storytelling systemicity: management, fractals and the Waldo Canyon fire  

By Tonya Henderson
OSI Research Methodology

Story Performances Collected

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Phase 1</th>
<th>Phase 2</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Story performances</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>10+ hours</td>
<td>11+ hours</td>
<td>21+ hours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Over 12000 lines of transcribed interview data

Aggregate themes

Analysis of fractal patterns from OSI data
Resources

2. [http://www.crec.co.uk/docs/Trustworthypaper.pdf](http://www.crec.co.uk/docs/Trustworthypaper.pdf) Strategies for ensuring trustworthiness in qualitative research projects
4. [https://www.academia.edu/3004263/Reliability_and_validity_in_qualitative_research_and_handling_qualitative_data_examples](https://www.academia.edu/3004263/Reliability_and_validity_in_qualitative_research_and_handling_qualitative_data_examples) Reliability and validity in qualitative research and handling qualitative data examples
What’s Up at MN & DN this summer?

1. VERY IMPORTANT – backwards map your summer work
2. 30 day writing challenge, 30 day work-life balance challenge, and 365s - keep you in touch with your work
3. Group work – RLC writing OR Lingerers
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