

# Week9-qualmethods2\_audioonly

Mon, 10/5 9:19PM 29:40

## SUMMARY KEYWORDS

researcher, qualitative, trustworthiness, participants, findings, quantitative, strategies, research, study, reflexivity, credibility, jane goodall, conclusions, data, important, resonance, documents, impact, quality, confidential

## SPEAKERS

Andrew Colombo-Dougovito



Andrew Colombo-Dougovito 00:01

Hello again, everybody. We are going to continue our discussion about qualitative methods with a lecture entitled going native, like Jane Goodall. And today we're going to be talking about how we determine, quote unquote, good qualitative work. So for those of you who don't know who Jane Goodall is, first, pause, go look up some Jane Goodall stuff on YouTube, she's pretty awesome. But she is an ethnographic researcher, who examines the culture of the great apes, and she does so through fieldwork. Now, within qualitative work, if you spend too much time in a particular setting, you can go it starts to become difficult to be objective, the the scientist and you starts to become blurred, because you are, you are becoming then a part of quality of your of your culture that you're studying. Now, it takes a lot of practice, it takes a lot of skill to to be embedded in a place like Jane Goodall was for so long, and still retain who you are as a researcher. Most often, it ends up looking a little bit more like this, where you have a researcher who's trying to fit in, who just simply does not. Right, they are clearly standing out. And then you start to run into some of the issues that we talked about last week, in terms of issue, or we talked about with quantitative methods, issues of validity, within your data. So for today, we are going to be talking about how you evaluate qualitative work, because it is different from how you evaluate quantitative work. We'll talk about some strategies to increase rigor. And then we'll do some application of it, which will be in our discussions for this week. So our evaluation within qualitative work, the evaluation process is markedly different from

quantitative methods, mostly, because for the length of time that we've been doing scientific work. Quantitative work has always been seen in the eyes of everybody else, as being the premier way to do research. And for a long time, qualitative researchers were not necessarily seen as, as valid as an important as the work that quantitative researchers were doing. And so because qualitative worker, researchers were tired of being compared to quantitative work, in terms of validity and and trustworthiness, or validity, and reliability, because you simply can't calculate that with qualitative work. They developed and put out their own terms. And there's several different researchers that have explained this in different ways. But it mostly comes back to a term of trustworthiness. So how trustworthy is your data? And there's multiple strategies in which you can show methodological rigor through the procedure in in how you lay out the methods of your qualitative study. So, trustworthiness was introduced by guba in 1981. And it was refined by Lincoln and guba in 1986. And it was the response to mostly a quantitative researchers critique of qualitative work, lacking validity and lacking rigor. And so, trustworthiness highlights authenticity and rigor through a truth value, the applicability, the consistency, and then neutrality. So the truth value is the credibility the applicability is the transferability. The consistencies that dependability. And the neutrality is the focus on participants views and not the researchers biases. So there's been lots of discussion about this topic in the subsequent years and up until today, which has resulted in a plethora of terminology. mostly due to the fact that quant work has been centered and considered the gold standard of research and methodologies. But qualitative researchers have always stood by the fact that qualitative methods are valid. And we're finding more and more that research needs qualitative work. In order to paint a bigger picture, data alone isn't going to give us all the answers. And because there's been lots of different discussions about this over the years, there's also been a lot of different terms that have been used pretty much interchangeably. And so when you look at a term like reflexivity, you're also looking at balance and engagement and honesty and position positionality and positioning and sincerity or transparency. Within credibility, you also see authenticity and critical interpretation, implausibility, and trustworthiness and verification. Within resonance, you'll see things like clarity and creativity. Within trying to determine ethics. Within qualitative work, you'll also see things like caring, and empathetic and sensitivity. You'll see in terms of contribution, impact, originality, persuasive relevance, and opposed to the quantitative term of significance. With coherence, you'll see terms like clarity, and congruence and understandability. So all of these terms have been interchangeably used interchangeably, mostly to describe the trustworthiness or the credibility of research. So as we delve further into what these topics mean, reflexivity focuses on the researchers backgrounds and their theoretical assumptions that impact the study. Last week, we talked about, sorry, last module, we talked about how the researcher serves as an instrument within qualitative work. And so it's important as the qualitative researcher to present your background and theoretical assumptions. That's why paradigm in qualitative

work is very important. Because how you align in how you define yourself or identify all of those things impact how you're going to interpret results. And if we don't know that, it's hard to understand how you get to a certain point, if I know you're coming from a certain paradigm, I can make sense with how you might interpret certain data. credibility encompasses the extent to which findings represent the experiences shared by the participants or observed by a researcher. So that's, that's basically what it sounds like. It's just Can we trust what we're seeing? resonance refers to the impact the study has on the readers? And does it actually transfer to them? Do they actually take that information and apply it into their own into their own lives? In quantitative work, we talk a lot about generalizability does it generalize to a large population one in qualitative work? We talk about transferability. So does it transfer into somebody else's? Is it written in a way that somebody can take that information and bring it into their own worldview and use that information? contribution addresses the way researcher research contributes to a deeper understanding? Alright, so this is the significance the impact that we talked about in quantitative work. contribution is does it extend our knowledge? Does it give us something deeper? Does it generate any insight? ethics obviously, addresses the importance of carrying out research in respectful, humane, honest and empathetic ways. The considerations are imperative in all stages of the research process, but different differ in their relevance and interpretation based on your paradigm and the approach. Meaning, all ethical considerations are important. But certain ways of viewing the world certain approaches that you might take might impact how you look at how you're being involved within your participants. Right? If you're doing ethnographic work, you're going to be very involved, you're in that observer as participant, or sorry, participant as observer or even just full participation. As a researcher, you're really into it. And you're working with the with the participants. And in some views of some, some researchers would look at that and going well, you're manipulating the data too much Well, for that person. That's not how they view the world. coherence refers to a coherent study, does it? Is it consistent? Is it clear, concise, all the way through the introduction into conclusion. And so often, qualitative work tends to be really longer because you provide a lot more description, but you still need to keep it concise. And it still needs to flow logically, just as a quantitative piece would. So how do we know when we've seen qualitative work that is following along with these these principles? Well, within interview studies, or within components of a more comprehensive study, you'd want to see that appropriate participants are selected. So they're purposely identified, they're effectively recruited, we have an adequate number for the for the design, and it's representative of that population of interest. So we talked in the last module about how you'd sample for that, and how that should match. And you looked at one of your studies, well, you need to go back and look at again and say, well, are these appropriate? Are the interview questions reasonable? Are they clearly worded and they're not leading? Have they allowed a sufficient amount of time to build the depth needed to come to the interpretations that they have? Are there adequate mechanisms

that are used to record and the transcribed the interviews? You know, if the person is just writing the interview based on memory and not going off at least an audio file, then it's, it may not be as trustworthy, right? I don't know how good that person's memory is. But I know, you probably can't remember everything. And so you'd likely want to see at least an audio recording of an interview and a transcription that is transcribed verbatim. Our participants, Representative sensitively, and fairly in the report, yeah. The report too negative? Or is the researcher being responsible to those participants? And have they used measures that we'll talk about a little bit later to ensure that confidentiality happened? Within observation studies? is an appropriate setting to be observed? Is there sufficient time spent in the field and, you know, the number of times that people actually go out and observe? You know, if they go out once, for 30 minutes? That's probably not good enough. But if they went out 10 times over a month, at varying times, for varying lengths, I'd say that's probably an appropriate amount of observation. Does the researcher fit into the site? You know, are they being accepted or respected, or unobtrusive? You know, if the researcher is saying there's problems here as well, that probably impacted the research. The research has minimal impact on the setting. So, for example, if you're observing, you shouldn't be changing anything, right? You were observing What's going on? In that particular setting. The only exception is for action research and an action research, you're actually trying to have an impact. So you're going into a setting, and you're doing some manipulation. So that's a difference. Our field note systematically collected, are they written during or soon after the observation? Again, you'd want to see researchers probably writing up their observations within 24 hours, after 24 hours, your memory starts to get a little fuzzy, especially now, when so many things are going on. Are there sound measures to ensure the confidentiality of participants and settings? Are they naming the setting that they're in? Because that breaches confidentiality and the ethics in doing this work? Within document analysis again, are they using the appropriate documents? Are they meaningful? Or they, you know, is there some kind of prevalent relevance for using specific artifacts or objects or text or pictures? And have they established that those are important documents? Are they obtained stored in a careful manner, I mean, documents need to be kept confidential. So they should be locked away or stored in a password protected folder on your computer that nobody else accesses in order to make sure you're ensuring those confidentiality of those reports, especially if there's names on them. If you find documents that are in the public domain, for example, you know, you find a newspaper article you find published written work that's put in the public domain, even most social media unless that person has a private profile, all of that is in the public domain. So you don't necessarily have to have the same as you don't have to have a stringent protocol for keeping that confidential because it is in the public domain. As we look at the data analysis process as a whole, are the results sorted and coded in a systematic and meaningful way? Are they providing enough description of the data analysis process for you to understand what was going on. And if

they provided significant rationale, or sufficient rationale for what they did or didn't do, are reflections about the researchers personal positions provided, sometimes you'll see this in in manuscripts. Sometimes you won't. And that's not for fault of the researcher, mostly because of space, in what was used to be printed journals, they didn't have as many as much space. And so that part usually gets cut out. And it still gets cut out to this day. Even though we're mostly publishing online, and page limits aren't really that important anymore. Are the conclusions substantiated by sufficient quotations from participants field notes in evidence from document inspection, etc, are they telling you not only what was found, but providing enough evidence about what was found? As you start to get into qualitative work, you'll see the the findings are a little bit different than the results of a quantitative paper. And in quantitative paper, you present the results just as is, it's pretty straightforward. And oftentimes, it's done in several paragraphs or less. Within qualitative work, this tends to be the bulk of a paper, you're going to see interpretation happening a little bit you're you're building a narrative, depending on the project around the findings that you have been, you've collected, and you've analyzed. And so you're providing this information. And you're providing quotations about these to support your positions, and, and your conclusions. And so now, we're going to move on to the strategies portion of this. So bringing it back to those terms I introduced just a little bit ago, reflexivity, credibility, resonance, ethics, contribution and coherence. There are several strategies within each of those that you can do to make sure you're demonstrating these Now you don't have to do all of them. And in most cases, you probably, at best can, should do at least one of each of these. But you'll probably use a couple, you don't need to use all of them. So for example, to show reflexivity, you might disclose the researcher bias. And you might have an audit trail, meaning you, you show that you've documented or you've mentioned, that you've documented the process, and by which you've done the data analysis. Within credibility, you're, you provide adequate data, you have code checking, you have peer debriefing, where you are working with a peer to debrief what is going on with your data. And if your conclusions actually makes sense. You've shown member checks where you actually take your data back to the participant that you worked with and say, Does this make sense? Is this transcript accurate? Are my conclusions in line with what you were thinking? Through this interview, you can also do triangulation, which is where you show the same thing happens in multiple different data points. So if, for example, you interview somebody, and then you go and do an observation, you're using triangulation to show Hey, the person told me this thing. And I saw it happen in this setting. So, you know, it's more evidence to my final point here. Within resonance, you're doing thick description, meaning you're, you're using rich, deep language that, that, that tells an entire story. It's not just simple one sentences here, there. The sample is situated within a certain particular area, you're presenting the information in a way that that people find resonance, right? That stirs something in that they they can make connections for themselves. Within ethics, right, you can being confidential, you're

using informed consent. You're being reflexive as a researcher to understand the process. Within contributions you're showing, there's future research suggestions, you're, you're showing there's some implication for practice. Maybe you developed a new methodological approach in this quantum in this qualitative paper. Then there's coherence, right? So you had appropriate research aims, there's there's coherence across all the different areas, and you have methodological congruence. Sometimes you'll hit these just simply doing good work, you don't have to do necessarily anything extra. So as you think about qualitative work, and in how to make sure your work is trustworthy, there are several things you can do. And we'll just go through this list quickly, but you can identify your background indentify personal bias, you clearly identify the strategies that you use throughout the data collection process. Explain how your chosen strategy aligns with your paradigmatic perspective, right? So if I'm using a constructivist lens, I'm going to show how that that lens led to the strategies that I used. Your writing style is something that readers can they don't just have to drone through, it actually flows like a narrative. It's something that that people actually want to read. It's transferable or you know, the context and findings described to allow somebody to gain insight. Does the introduction and review of literature clearly demonstrated need? How do the study findings contribute to the professional practice in your field? How do findings contribute to the enhancing of theoretical knowledge? How do you study findings enhance other research findings in a field? or other future research suggestions? based on those findings? Was it ethically approved? What's the nature of the relationship between the researchers and the participants? How did you? How did your relationship with the participants impact the findings? What procedures Did you follow for leaving the field? and sharing your findings? Is there a clear line of thought from the intro through the conclusions? Do your methods align with your methodology and the stated paradigmatic approach? Do the strategies you choose align with your stated purpose? Did your study achieve the stated purpose? And it's also important to note that, you know, they're not necessarily going to be equally important, or evident in all studies. Right? So as you asked those questions that we just went through, as you start to look at quality, within qualitative work, be aware of an indicate any, any paradigm under which you're working, that's an important thing to set out ahead of time, indicate the criteria of importance to your work based on that perspective, right. So some criteria can can be broken without impacting the quality of your work. Some of it can't. And you have to explain why if you did break some of that criteria. Demonstrate evidence that your criteria of importance were achieved. Demonstrate evidence that your chosen criteria and strategies are consistent. How did you assess my methodological quality within your own study? Did you use any guidelines or a rubric for a systematic review or systemic review? Did you have quality summary scores to distinguish between high and low quality studies? Did you exclude studies with low metal methodological quality? So as you're thinking about these different pieces, you know, you want to make sure you have answers to at least most of them. Right. And so



tying all the way back now, to Jane Goodall, and going native, if, as the researcher, you are using strategies that we've gone through in this presentation, if you've made sure that you have kept a systematic that you've kept systematic notes, and details about your process, if you have kept an audit trail, if you are making sure to be reflective as a researcher and realize when you're becoming too close, or when your your view is not being scholarly, if you're if you're starting to lose that sight. If you've built in all of these different processes, or at least many of them, it becomes easier to show quality within qualitative work and be able to do the type of work in which you are really involved. And you're you're really working on an individual basis within qualitative work. So what I'd like you to do for the first discussion this week, is get out a qualitative article that you found for this week, in addition to the questions that have ask you, I also want you to read through the methods and the results, and the discussion for aspects of trustworthiness and any specific strategies that they used. And I want you to let me know, how did the authors represent the truth value, the applicability, the consistency, or the neutrality. And to do so remember, you can look at either this criteria or the criteria in the strategies shown a few slides ago. But as you go down through if you're, I've left this one in, because I know a lot of you have quantitative backgrounds. And so it'll help to see those terms next to each other. So again, objectivity, neutrality, confirm ability, reliability, dependability, internal validity, credibility, external validity, transferability. And it, there's some strategies there, there's some more on the other slide. So again, go through the article that you found that was qualitative. If you don't have one that you can think of, you may have to go and look for one. for discussion number two, I'd like you to pick one of the following research topics I want you to you can either pick high rate of public school teacher turnover, low rate of recreational gym use by individuals with disabilities, and senior citizen adherence to daily physical activity regimen. And I'd like to design a qualitative study focused in on the above topic. So what I mean by that is not just I'm going to do a phenomenology. Okay. Well tell me what data you're going to collect? How are you going to do the interviews? What quality criteria are you going to use to make sure that you have a trustworthy study, and that you're meeting all of the different criteria that we just talked about all the quality indicators that we just talked about? Okay. So in conclusion, the process of data collection, within qualitative work involves a dynamic interaction between the researcher and the participant and the context of the investigation. When you think about that, in how it differs from quantitative work, you can see how it gives a different type of information. It gives different types of, of data that can be used to imply different things. There's also a whole nother set of concerns, both quality wise and ethically, in doing work in which there is a deep connection between the researcher and the participant. There are many means to demonstrate your trustworthiness, you just have to make sure the methods that are chosen online with the research project on are clearly defined. So just because it's qualitative work, doesn't mean there's not a system systematic process by which the research is conducted. In many

cases, the process needs to be documented in a much clearer sense, and a much more, much more in depth. In some cases than quantitative work. Simply because you are the instrument you are part of this study. And if you're not showing what happened, it's difficult to judge whether that study is trustworthy or not. And having a better understanding of yourself will help guide any of you down a qualitative research practice. the more confident you can be and are within your own understanding of your paradigm. Your ontological and epistemological stances is going to help you in determining the methods that you use, and those criteria and those criteria that you use to show how trustworthy your data is.