

ADVANCED QUALITATIVE DATA ANALYSIS

Course Number:	SW 388R	Instructor:	Dr. Lauren E. Gulbas
Unique Number:	59185	Office:	SSW 3.122C
Semester:	Spring 2019	Contact:	(512) 232-4418 laurengulbas@austin.utexas.edu
Meeting Time & Place:	Thursday 2:00 pm – 5:00 pm Room 2.116 (SSW)	Office Hours:	See Canvas Scheduler

I. COURSE DESCRIPTION

This is an elective course for doctoral students who want additional training in qualitative methods. Most introductory courses offer students the opportunity to work on the early phases of a qualitative project, for example, developing a research question, choosing an approach, constructing an interview or observation guide, entering the field and collecting data; but students typically have little time to focus on the later phases of data analysis and writing. This course is designed to take up where introductory courses leave off by focusing on the epistemological and practical issues of *analyzing* qualitative data and writing up the results.

This course will be conducted in seminar fashion, allowing students to tailor the learning experience to their particular needs. Students must have permission of the instructor and have successfully completed SW 388R3 (Introduction to Qualitative Methods) or a similar course. They must have access to pre-collected data for analysis or consult with the instructor about a suitable project. While targeted to social work students, this course is appropriate for advanced doctoral students in any of the social and behavioral sciences.

II. COURSE OBJECTIVES

By the end of the semester, the student will complete analysis and writing on a qualitative study and should be able to:

- Identify the similarities and differences between major paradigms and traditions of text analysis
- Demonstrate a working knowledge of how to select and apply appropriate methods for analyzing texts, based on the aims and research questions of a given project
- Assess the potential uses of qualitative data analysis software and, if appropriate, demonstrate its use in their particular project.
- Apply different analytic strategies for identifying themes in qualitative data, coding, building data displays, and making comparisons within and between cases in a qualitative data set
- Identify threats to trustworthiness in a particular project and be able to apply appropriate strategies to enhance rigor. In particular, all students will maintain an audit trail of decisions made during the analytic process.
- Critically examine the limitations of their project
- Communicate the results of analysis through oral presentation and written work

III. TEACHING METHODS

This class takes as its starting point the principles of universal design and trauma-informed pedagogy. Each of us learns differently, and my goal is to facilitate your success by supporting your learning needs. For example, many of us need time to process our thoughts orally, thus, you can select to submit a video for the class to watch in lieu of an n-vivo presentation. Perhaps the act of writing is difficult. If “talking out” your paper is a strategy that works best, I can help you access dictation and transcription software. Feel free to take breaks

throughout class as needed (but do try to arrive on time). Just remember – I can support you best when you let me know your needs.

As your professor in this seminar, I will act as a guide and facilitator. The format of the course will be hands-on, giving you an opportunity to *learn by doing* in all aspects of the course—in class meetings and in out-of-class assignments. Instruction will focus on key concepts and practice, and class time will be an opportunity to share “aha” moments and successes, as well as to seek guidance, ask questions, and offer critique and suggestions for addressing challenges in qualitative data analysis.

IV. TEXTS AND MATERIALS

Guest, G., MacQueen, K. M., & Namey, E. E. (2012). *Applied thematic analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

- Please note that this book is available electronically through UT’s library system
- Additional required readings listed in the Course Schedule will be made available electronically on Canvas

SOFTWARE. Throughout the class, we will discuss the pros and cons of using software, our experiences with different kinds of software, and when software might be most beneficial. Software is neither required nor recommended for all projects, but if you are interested in using QDA software in this class, there are several free versions of QDA software available, including:

- QDAMiner Lite (<http://provalisresearch.com/products/qualitative-data-analysis-software/freeware/>)
- Coding Analysis Toolkit (<http://cat.ucsur.pitt.edu/>)
- Also, several programs offer free trial uses, including MAXQDATA, ATLAS.ti, and QSR NVivo
- Finally, don’t underestimate the power of Microsoft Word and Excel for engaging in qualitative data analysis!

SUPPLEMENTARY READINGS. The following supplementary texts are recommended as supplementary reference materials, if you wish to deepen your skills in methods for analyzing qualitative data:

- Bernard, R. H., Wutich, A., & Ryan, G. W. (2016). *Analyzing qualitative data: Systematic approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (2015). *Basics of qualitative research* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Flick, U. (Ed.). (2014). *The sage handbook of qualitative data analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage publications.
- Saldaña, J. (2015). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Schensul, S. L., Schensul, J. J., & LeCompte, M. D. (2010). *Ethnographer’s toolkit* (2nd ed., 7 Volumes). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

V. COURSE REQUIREMENTS

Your final grade has four components: online field notes and audit trail (30%),¹ “Building your QDA Expertise” assignment (30%), workshop papers and presentation (15%), final report (25%). Additional instructions for completing each assignment will be described in class.

¹ This assignment draws from the following sources: 1) Gravlee, C. C. (2010). Text analysis. Available at: www.gravlee.org/aqd; and 2) Wright, M. C. (2007). Making sense of data: How public health graduate students build theory through qualitative research techniques. *Qualitative health research*, 17(1), 94-101.

ONLINE AUDIT TRAIL (30%). The purpose of this assignment is to help you develop a reflexive understanding of your learning process and of the strengths and weaknesses of different methods. To complete this assignment, you are expected to keep a running journal (e.g., field notes, research memos, audit trails) of your learning experience as you work on your independent research project. You will keep this audit trail in the form of a discussion post to which all course participants will have access. Each week, you should add one new post that addresses in detail the following issues in your work on the independent research project:

- List and detail new steps you have taken this week in the organization, management, and analysis of data for your project. ***Be specific!***
- Describe new and ongoing analytical reflections.
- Delineate challenges, difficulties, “aha” moments, and/or questions you have had.

The strongest posts are those that will integrate both scholarly learning (what you have learned through class readings) and practical learning (what you have learned working on your own project). In the beginning, it is most likely that your posts will reflect your understanding of readings, your evolving understanding of qualitative data analysis, and reflections on your research project. Later on (after 1 or 2 posts), you should use your entries as a space to reflect specifically on emerging ideas from your data analysis, and how different analytical techniques yield new insights about your data. When writing your post, refer (i.e., cite and reference) to any readings that may have contributed to your understanding. Posts can be of any length, but should generally range between 750 and 1000 words.

At the end of the semester, you will have an opportunity to revise one of your discussion posts for publication on an online qualitative research blog. The final blog should describe a particular challenge, difficulty, or question that you had, and describe how you went about addressing that issue.

All posts are ***due by 11:59 pm the day prior to class.***

“BUILDING YOUR QDA EXPERTISE” ASSIGNMENT (30%). One of the requirements of a Ph.D. is that you develop methodological expertise as it relates to carrying out your dissertation research. Thus, an implicit objective of this class is that, through your own work, you will become a budding expert in qualitative data analysis. To help you build and expand your knowledge to accomplish this objective, you will be required to complete the following assignment. After reading the required articles for a given week, identify and list five additional references that you think are worth reading in order to expand your knowledge and build your expertise. For example, perhaps you have an enduring question about your own data analysis (it may or may not related to the class topic for that week). Use this as an opportunity to use the extant literature to answer your question, and go into depth about methodological and analytical questions you have as it relates to your own qualitative interests!

After you have listed the references, choose one to read. Then, write a critical summary about the reference. Your critical summary should be organized around the following questions:

1. Why did you choose this article to read instead of the other four you identified?
2. What is the *analytical technique* being discussed?
3. What new analytical strategies did you learn from reading the article?
4. What new strategies will you apply to your own analysis? Why?
5. In your opinion, does the article advance knowledge about qualitative data analysis? If yes, how? If no, what could the author have done to strengthen the article?

Critical summaries and the list of five references are ***due at the beginning of class in hard copy format.*** There is no page length requirement—you should use this assignment as an opportunity to go into depth about

methodological and analytical questions you have as it relates to your own qualitative interests, and to get feedback on your insights! Be prepared to discuss what you have learned in class.

WORKSHOP PRESENTATIONS (15%). You will be expected to carry out practice exercises on your own data outside of class in order to gain hands-on experience carrying out certain analytical tasks and prepare you for the completion of your final report. You will be required to present your work in the form of a 10-minute presentation constructive feedback and critique. Use this as an opportunity to “workshop” ideas, questions, or challenges you are having with your data set. Use this time strategically! If there is a specific element on which you wish to receive feedback, make sure that it is part of your presentation (e.g., drafts of codebooks, matrices, etc.). Following your 10 minutes, the class will engage in a critical discussion to advance your own thinking and analysis on the topic.

FINAL REPORT (25%). The purpose of the final report is to give you an opportunity to practice methods of analyzing qualitative data in a substantive area of interest to you. In the final report, you will analyze a qualitative data set. You must decide and inform me of the data set you will use no later than our **second meeting of the semester**. In choosing this data set, you have the following three options—in order of my preference—for choice of a data set to analyze:

- Qualitative data you have collected from your own research
- Secondary analysis of existing data available from another researcher or through a data archive such as Qualidata (<http://www.esds.ac.uk/qualidata/>)
- A new data set collected from naturally occurring text (e.g., published speeches, Internet discussion boards or blogs, published research articles, memoir).

It is not my expectation that your final product be an article ready for publication. However, to prepare you for the steps necessary in publishing qualitative work, you should identify a peer-reviewed journal that would be appropriate for your research and prepare the paper according to the journal’s submission guidelines. If you have questions about how to select an appropriate journal for publication, you might find the following resources helpful:

- “How to choose an academic journal for your article.” <http://getalifephd.blogspot.com/2011/09/how-to-choose-academic-journal-for-your.html>
- “Publishing strategies.” <https://nequalsone.wordpress.com/2011/12/24/publishing-strategies-generally/>
- “How to write a journal article in 6 steps: Step 1-Analyze a model.” <https://nequalsone.wordpress.com/2014/03/09/how-to-write-a-journal-article-in-a-currently-unnumbered-number-of-steps-step-1-analyze-a-model/>

Although your report should include a *brief* introduction and discussion section, your report—as a methods paper—should prioritize a description of: (1) the epistemological foundations of your methodology and analytic approach; (2) why and how your approach permits you to answer the specific research questions that you are asking of your data; (3) the methods of your approach, including sampling strategy, data collection, data management, and data analysis; (4) an assessment of the rigour and limitations of your methods; and (5) a description of your findings. The main text (excluding references, tables, figures) should be between 5000 and 6000 words. Complete drafts of your paper are due for peer review on **Thursday, May 2**. Failure to submit a complete draft will result in a significant deduction in points from your grade on your final report. Final papers are **due Thursday, May 14 at 5:00 pm**.

VI. GRADES

A	94.0 +	C+	77.0 – 79.999	D-	60.0 – 63.999
A-	90.0 – 93.999	C	74.0 – 76.9991	F	Below 60.0
B+	87.0 – 89.999	C-	70.0 – 73.999	<i>Please Note: Grades will not be rounded.</i>	
B	84.0 – 86.999	D+	67.0 – 69.999		
B-	80.0 – 83.999	D	64.0 – 66.999		

VII. CLASS POLICIES

NAMES AND PRONOUNS. At UT, we aim to facilitate advocacy, dialogue, and learning around issues related to gender equity. The ways in which we choose to address one another, through the use of preferred names and pronouns, can be a strategy that fosters an inclusive learning environment. Accordingly, each of us will honor and respect an individual's request to be addressed according to their preferred name, with correct pronunciation, and gender pronoun.

LATE ASSIGNMENTS. Sometimes, life rears its ugly head, making it difficult for us to complete our requisite responsibilities. Thus, for one major assignment—defined here as an individual assignment that contributes more than 5% of your grade—you get a week extension without penalty. After that, I will deduct 5% from the assignment grade every 24 hours until the assignment is submitted. For minor assignments, I will deduct 5% from the assignment grade until it is submitted. Please note that my goal is to help facilitate your success. To this end, if you use your extension and then submit another major assignment late, or miss several class meetings and/or minor assignments, I will schedule a meeting with you to strategize how best to ensure your success. Please, if you anticipate being unable to meet an assignment deadline, let me know in advance so we can work together!

OFFICE HOURS. I strongly encourage you to reach out to me so that I can support your engagement and performance in this course. The best way to do this is to come to office hours! If you have questions about assignments, course content, accessibility accommodations, or academic life (e.g., career trajectory, research, mentorship), please reach out to me. I have office hours weekly, usually on Tuesday afternoon. You do not bother me by coming to office hours—instead, I view this as an opportunity to facilitate your success in this course and as a doctoral student.

PARTICIPATION. As is the case in most doctoral-level seminars, you are expected to participate actively in classroom discussions. This means coming to class having completed the readings for that day and bringing both your questions and ideas/thoughts/reflections concerning those readings. I also encourage you to bring “additional” sources of information to share with the class as pertaining to the topic(s) of discussion. This may include sharing information you have learned from other classes, or simply relating your own experiences and observations as it relates to qualitative research. We will be discussing a variety of theoretical ideas and empirical issues that may hold special significance to students. It is important to discuss ideas in a supportive and respectful manner, acknowledging that others may have different opinions. I encourage you to see things from a different point of view and use feedback from each other to augment your ideas. And while I encourage debate and disagreement as a productive aspect of classroom discussion, all students will be expected to act in a respectful manner toward members of our class at all times. Respect extends to the ways in which we talk about and discuss our participants' lives. ***It is never acceptable to adopt a manner of speech you think represents the ways you think your participants speak.*** Doing so contributes to stereotyping and bias. Always use your own voice and speaking mannerisms when representing the voice of your participants.

CELL PHONE POLICY. Instruction in this class will consist of discussion, with occasional lecture as needed to demonstrate analytical processes. Your attention, engagement, and participation are crucial to the learning

process. To facilitate this, you may not use cell phones during class. On occasion, exceptions to this policy can be made (e.g., accessibility accommodation, family emergency).

TRIGGERING AND CHALLENGING MATERIALS. In this course, you will be immersed in a qualitative data set that, depending on the topic, may be triggering or emotionally challenging. Each of us brings to qualitative research our unique personal experiences, making it difficult to predict how your data will affect you. If you anticipate that certain data might be triggering, please come meet with me so that we can discuss possible strategies to put in place that will allow you to engage in the course to your fullest potential. Sometimes, however, we cannot anticipate what will be triggering. To this end, listen to your body and your needs. You can always leave class to take a break.

VIII. UNIVERSITY POLICIES

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS HONOR CODE. The core values of The University of Texas at Austin are learning, discovery, freedom, leadership, individual opportunity, and responsibility. Each member of the university is expected to uphold these values through integrity, honesty, trust, fairness, and respect toward peers and community.

PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT AND CIVILITY IN THE CLASSROOM. The professor expects students to act as professionals in class. This means students should arrive on time for class, be prepared to participate in the class discussion, and show respect for one another's opinions. A course brings together a group of diverse individuals with various backgrounds. Students are influenced and shaped by such factors as race, ethnicity, gender, sex, physical abilities, religious and political beliefs, national origins, and sexual orientations, among others. We expect to learn from each other in an atmosphere of positive engagement and mutual respect. This atmosphere includes working intentionally to recognize and dismantle racism, sexism, heterosexism, and ableism in the classroom. Social Work also deals with complex and controversial issues. These issues may be challenging and uncomfortable, and it would be impossible to offer a substantive classroom experience that did not include potentially difficult conversations relating to challenging issues. In this environment, we will be exposed to diverse ideas and opinions, and sometimes we will not agree with the ideas expressed by others. Nevertheless, the professor requires that students engage one another with civility, respect, and professionalism.

UNANTICIPATED DISTRESS. Students may experience unexpected and/or distressing reactions to course readings, videos, conversations, and assignments. If so, students are encouraged to inform the professor. The professor can be responsive and supportive regarding students' participation in course assignments and activities, but students are responsible for communicating clearly what kind of support is desired. If counseling is needed, students may contact a service provider of their choosing, including the UT Counseling Center at 512-471-3515 or online at <https://cmhc.utexas.edu/>.

POLICY ON SOCIAL MEDIA AND PROFESSIONAL COMMUNICATION. Public social networks are not private. Even when open only to approved or invited members, users cannot be certain that privacy will exist among the general membership of sites. If social work students choose to participate in such forums, please assume that anything posted can be seen, read, and critiqued. What is said, posted, linked to, commented on, uploaded, subscribed to, etc., can be accessed and archived, posing potential harm to professional reputations and prospective careers.

Social work students who use social media (e.g. Facebook, Twitter, Instagram) and other forms of electronic communication (e.g. blogs) must be mindful of how their communication may be perceived by clients, colleagues, faculty, and others. Social work students are expected to make every effort to minimize material

which could be considered inappropriate for a professional social worker in training. Because of this, social work students are advised to manage security settings at their most private levels and avoid posting information/photos or using any language that could jeopardize their professional image.

Students are asked to consider the amount of personal information posted on these sites and are obliged to block any client access to involvement in the students' social networks. Client material should not be referred to in any form of electronic media, including *any* information that might lead to the identification of a client or compromise client confidentiality in *any* way. Additionally, students must critically evaluate any material that is posted regarding community agencies and professional relationships, as certain material could violate the standards set by the School of Social Work, the Texas Code of Conduct for Social Workers, and/or the NASW Code of Ethics.

Social work students should consider that they will be representing professional social work practice as well as The University of Texas at Austin School of Social Work program while in the classroom, the university community, and the broader area communities.

POLICY ON SCHOLASTIC DISHONESTY. Students who violate University rules on scholastic dishonesty are subject to disciplinary penalties, including the possibility of failure in the course and/or dismissal from the University. Since such dishonesty harms the individual, all students, and the integrity of the University, policies on scholastic dishonesty will be strictly enforced. For further information, the student may refer to the Web Site of the Student Judicial Services, Office of the Dean of Students: <http://deanofstudents.utexas.edu/sjs/>.

USE OF COURSE MATERIALS. The materials used in this course, including, but not limited to exams, quizzes, and homework assignments, are copyright protected works. Any unauthorized duplication of the course materials is a violation of federal law and may result in disciplinary action being taken against the student. Additionally, the sharing of course materials without the specific, express approval of the professor may be a violation of the University's Student Honor Code and an act of academic dishonesty, which could result in further disciplinary action. This sharing includes, among other things, uploading class materials to websites for the purpose of distributing those materials to other current or future students.

DOCUMENTED DISABILITY STATEMENT. Any student who requires special accommodations must obtain a letter that documents the disability from the Services for Students with Disabilities area of the Division of Diversity and Community Engagement (471- 6259 voice or 471-4641 TTY for users who are deaf or hard of hearing). A student should present the letter to the professor at the beginning of the semester so that needed accommodations can be discussed and followed. The student should remind the professor of any testing accommodations no later than five business days before an exam. For more information, visit: <http://diversity.utexas.edu/disability/>.

RELIGIOUS HOLIDAYS. By UT Austin policy, students must notify the professor of a pending absence at least fourteen days prior to the date of observance of a religious holy day. If the student must miss a class, examination, work assignment, or project in order to observe a religious holy day, the professor will give the student an opportunity to complete the missed work within a reasonable time after the absence.

TITLE IX REPORTING. In accordance with Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, the University of Texas at Austin is committed to maintaining a learning environment that is free from discriminatory conduct on the basis of sex <https://titleix.utexas.edu/>. Faculty, field instructors, staff, and/or teaching assistants in their supervisory roles are mandated reporters of incidents of sex discrimination, sexual harassment, sexual violence, stalking, dating violence, or any other forms of sexual misconduct. Students who report such

incidents will be informed of University resources. Incidents will be reported to the University's Title IX Coordinator. Further information, including student resources related to Title IX, may also be found at <https://titleix.utexas.edu/>.

CAMPUS CARRY POLICY. The University's policy on concealed firearms may be found here: <https://campuscarry.utexas.edu>. You also may find this information by accessing the Quick Links menu on the School's website.

CLASSROOM CONFIDENTIALITY. Information shared in class about agencies, clients, and personal matters is considered confidential per the NASW Code of Ethics on educational supervision and is protected by regulations of the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) as well. As such, sharing this information with individuals outside of the educational context is not permitted. Violations of confidentiality could result in actions taken according to the policies and procedure for review of academic performance located in sections 3.0, 3.1, and 3.2 of the Standards for Social Work Education.

USE OF E-MAIL FOR OFFICIAL CORRESPONDENCE TO STUDENTS. Email is recognized as an official mode of university correspondence; therefore, students are responsible for reading their email for university and course-related information and announcements. Students are responsible for keeping the university informed about a change of e-mail address. Students should check their e-mail regularly and frequently—daily, but at minimum twice a week—to stay current with university-related communications, some of which may be time-sensitive. Students can find UT Austin's policies and instructions for updating their e-mail address at <http://www.utexas.edu/its/policies/emailnotify.php>.

SAFETY. As part of professional social work education, students may have assignments that involve working in agency settings and/or the community. As such, these assignments may present some risks. Sound choices and caution may lower risks inherent to the profession. It is the student's responsibility to be aware of and adhere to policies and practices related to agency and/or community safety. Students should notify the professor regarding any safety concerns.

BEHAVIOR CONCERNS ADVICE LINE (BCAL). If students have concerns about their behavioral health, or if they are concerned about the behavioral health of someone else, students may use the Behavior Concerns Advice Line to discuss by phone their concerns. This service is provided through a partnership between the Office of the Dean of Students, the Counseling and Mental Health Center (CMHC), the Employee Assistance Program (EAP), and The University of Texas Police Department (UTPD). Call 512-232-5050 or visit <http://www.utexas.edu/safety/bcal>.

EMERGENCY EVACUATION POLICY. Occupants of buildings on the UT Austin campus are required to evacuate and assemble outside when a fire alarm is activated or an announcement is made. Please be aware of the following policies regarding evacuation:

- Familiarize yourself with all exit doors in the classroom and the building. Remember that the nearest exit door may not be the one you used when entering the building.
- If you require assistance to evacuate, inform the professor in writing during the first week of class.
- In the event of an evacuation, follow the professor's instructions.
- Do not re-enter a building unless you are given instructions by the Austin Fire Department, the UT Austin Police Department, or the Fire Prevention Services office.

IX. COURSE SCHEDULE

Note: The course schedule is a guide for the course and is subject to change with advanced notice.

Week 1 | January 23 | Introduction and Overview

Recommended Reading:

- Guest et al., (2012). Introduction to Applied Thematic Analysis. *Applied thematic analysis* (pp. 3-20). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Liamputtong, P. (2009). Qualitative data analysis: conceptual and practical considerations. *Health Promotion Journal of Australia*, 20(2), 133-139.

Week 2 | January 30 | Developing an Analytic Plan

DUE: Audit Trail #1; Critical Reading Summary #1

Required Reading:

- Birks, M., Chapman, Y., & Francis, K. (2008). Memoing in qualitative research: Probing data and processes. *Journal of Research in Nursing*, 13(1), 68-75.
- Guest et al. (2012). Planning and Preparing the Analysis. *Applied thematic analysis* (pp. 21-48). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Guest, G., Namey, E., Mitchell, M. L. (2013). Qualitative data management. *Collecting qualitative data: A field manual for applied research* (pp. 275-316). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Rodgers, B. L., & Cowles, K. V. (1993). The qualitative research audit trail: A complex collection of documentation. *Research in Nursing & Health*, 16, 219-226.

Recommended Reading:

- Allan, H. T., Arber, A., Ayers, N., Cane, T. C., Li, S., Mounce, G., & Tapson, K. (2018). Pulling it all together: emotional reflexivity in health and social care field research. In *Emotions and Reflexivity in Health & Social Care Field Research* (pp. 159-165). Palgrave Macmillan, Cham.
- Guest et al. (2012). Choosing Qualitative Data Analysis Software. *Applied thematic analysis* (pp. 217-240). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Week 3 | February 6 | Thematic Analysis and Descriptive Coding

DUE: Audit Trail #2; Critical Reading Summary #2

Required Reading:

- Elliott, V. (2018). Thinking about the Coding Process in Qualitative Data Analysis. *The Qualitative Report*, 23(11), 2850-2861.
- Guest et al., (2012). Themes and Codes. *Applied thematic analysis* (pp. 49-78). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Guest et al., (2012), "Optimizing Focus Group Data," in Supplemental Analytic Techniques. *Applied thematic analysis* (pp. 118-123). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M. & Saldaña, J. (2014). Fundamentals of Qualitative Data Analysis. *Qualitative Data Analysis: A Methods Sourcebook*, 3rd Ed (p.69-104). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Recommended Reading:

- Barbour, R. S. (2014). Analysing focus groups. In U. Flick, (Ed.), *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Data Analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative research in psychology*, 3(2), 77-101.

- Maxwell, J. A., & Miller, B. A. (2008). Categorizing and connecting strategies in qualitative data analysis. In S. N. Hesse-Biber & P. Leavy (Eds.), *Handbook of emergent methods* (pp. 461-477). New York, NY: The Guildford Press.
- Sandelowski, M. (2010). What's in a name? Qualitative description revisited. *Research in Nursing & Health, 33*(1), 77-84.

Week 4 | February 13 | Achieving Qualitative “Power”

DUE: Audit Trail #3; Critical Reading Summary #3

Required Reading:

- Hagaman, A. K., & Wutich, A. (2017). How many interviews are enough to identify metathemes in multisited and cross-cultural research? Another perspective on Guest, Bunce, and Johnson’s (2006) landmark study. *Field Methods, 29*(1), 23-41.
- Hennink, M. M., Kaiser, B. N., & Marconi, V. C. (2017). Code saturation versus meaning saturation: How many interviews are enough?. *Qualitative Health Research, 27*(4), 591-608.
- Namey, E., Guest, G., McKenna, K., & Chen, M. (2016). Evaluating bang for the buck: A cost-effectiveness comparison between individual interviews and focus groups based on thematic saturation levels. *American Journal of Evaluation, 37*(3), 425-440.
- Nelson, J. (2017). Using conceptual depth criteria: Addressing the challenge of reaching saturation in qualitative research. *Qualitative Research, 17*(5), 554-570.

Recommended Reading:

- Kerr, C., Nixon, A., & Wild, D. (2010). Assessing and demonstrating data saturation in qualitative inquiry supporting patient-reported outcomes research. *Expert Review of Pharmacoeconomics & Outcomes Research, 10*(3), 269-281.
- Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Leech, N. L. (2007). A call for qualitative power analyses. *Quality & Quantity, 41*(1), 105-121.

Week 5 | February 20 | WORKSHOP I

DUE: Workshop Presentation #1 (*Suggested: 4-6 IDIs or 2 FGs coded*)

Week 6 | February 27 | Grounded Theory

DUE: Audit Trail #4; Critical Reading Summary #4

Required Reading:

- Clarke, A. E. (2007). Grounded theory: Critiques, debates, and situational analysis. In W. Outhwaite & S. P. Turner (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Social Science Methodology* (p. 423-442). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Draucker, C. B., Martsof, D. S., Ross, R., & Rusk, T. B. (2007). Theoretical sampling and category development in grounded theory. *Qualitative Health Research, 17*(8), 1137-1148.
- Glaser, B. G. (1965). The constant comparative method of qualitative analysis. *Social problems, 12*(4), 436-445.
- Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1964). The social loss of dying patients. *The American Journal of Nursing, 119*-121.
- Walker, D., & Myrick, F. (2006). Grounded theory: An exploration of process and procedure. *Qualitative Health Research, 16*(4), 547-559.

Recommended Reading:

- Boeije, H. (2002). A purposeful approach to the constant comparative method in the analysis of qualitative interviews. *Quality and Quantity, 36*(4), 391-409.

- Charmaz, K. (2017). The power of constructivist grounded theory for critical inquiry. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 23(1), 34-45.
- Charmaz, K. (1990). 'Discovering' chronic illness: Using grounded theory. *Social Science & Medicine*, 30(11), 1161-1172.
- Charmaz, K. (2005). Grounded theory in the 21st century: Applications for advancing social justice studies. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed., pp. 507-535). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Hutchison, A. J., Johnston, L. H., & Breckon, J. D. (2010). Using QSR-NVivo to facilitate the development of a grounded theory project: An account of a worked example. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 13(4), 283-302.
- Pawluch, D., & Neiterman, E. (2010). What is grounded theory and where does it come from?. In I. Bourgeault, R. Dingwall, & R. de Vries (Eds.), *The sage handbook of qualitative methods in health research* (pp. 174-192). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Week 7 | March 5 | Narrative Analysis

DUE: Audit Trail #5; Critical Reading Summary #5

Required Readings:

- McCormack, C. (2000). From interview transcript to interpretive story: Part 1—Viewing the transcript through multiple lenses. *Field Methods*, 12(4), 282-297.
- McCormack, C. (2000). From interview transcript to interpretive story: Part 2—developing an interpretive story. *Field Methods*, 12(4), 298-315.
- Ollerenshaw, J. A., & Creswell, J. W. (2002). Narrative research: A comparison of two restorying data analysis approaches. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 8(3), 329-347.
- Roy, K. M. (2006). Father stories a life course examination of paternal identity among low-income African American men. *Journal of Family Issues*, 27(1), 31-54.
- Vindrola-Padros, C., & Johnson, G. A. (2014). The narrated, nonnarrated, and the disnarrated: Conceptual tools for analyzing narratives in health services research. *Qualitative Health Research*, 24(11), 1603-1611.

Recommended Reading:

- Riessman, C. K., & Quinney, L. (2005). Narrative in social work: A critical review. *Qualitative Social Work*, 4(4), 391-412.
- Riessman, C. K. (2011). What's different about narrative inquiry? Cases, categories and contexts. In D. Silverman (Ed.), *Qualitative Research*, 3rd ed (pp. 310-330). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Week 8 | March 12 | Phenomenological Analysis

DUE: Audit Trail #6; Critical Reading Summary #6

Required Reading:

- Gallagher, S. & Zahavi, D. (2008). Methodologies. In *The Phenomenological Mind* (p. 15-50). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Martiny, K. M. (2015). How to develop a phenomenological model of disability. *Medicine, Health Care and Philosophy*, 18(4), 553-565.
- Zahavi, D., & Martiny, K. M. (2019). Phenomenology in nursing studies: New perspectives. *International journal of nursing studies*, 93, 155-162.

Recommended Reading:

- Giorgi, A. (1997). The theory, practice, and evaluation of the phenomenological method as a qualitative research procedure. *Journal of phenomenological psychology*, 28(2), 235-260.
- van Manen, M. (2017). But Is It Phenomenology?. *Qualitative Health Research*, 27(6), 775-779.

- Smith, J. A. (2018). "Yes It Is Phenomenological": A Reply to Max Van Manen's Critique of Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis. *Qualitative health research*, 28(12), 1955-1958.
- Zahavi, D. (2018). Getting It Quite Wrong: Van Manen and Smith on Phenomenology. *Qualitative Health Research*, doi: 10.1177/1049732318817547

Week 9 | March 26 | WORKSHOP II

DUE: Workshop Presentation #2 (*Suggested: 6-10 IDIs or 3-4 FGs coded*)

Week 10 | April 2 | Making Comparisons

DUE: Audit Trail #7; Critical Reading Summary #7

Required Reading:

- Guest et al., (2012). Comparing Thematic Data. *Applied thematic analysis* (pp. 161-186). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Lindsay, S. (2018). Five Approaches to Qualitative Comparison Groups in Health Research: A Scoping Review. *Qualitative Health Research*, 1049732318807208.
- Miles, Huberman, & Saldaña, (2014). Designing matrix and network displays. *Qualitative Data Analysis: A Methods Sourcebook*, 3rd Ed (p.107-119). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Sandelowski, M. (2001). Real qualitative researchers do not count: The use of numbers in qualitative research. *Research in Nursing & Health*, 24(3), 230-240.

Recommended Reading:

- Ayres, L., Kavanaugh, K., & Knafl, K. A. (2003). Within-case and across-case approaches to qualitative data analysis. *Qualitative Health Research*, 13(6), 871-883.
- Guest et al. (2012). Data Reduction Techniques. *Applied thematic analysis* (pp. 129-160). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Week 11 | April 9 | Toward Qualitative Rigour

DUE: Audit Trail #8; Critical Reading Summary #8

Required Reading:

- Cypress, B. S. (2017). Rigor or reliability and validity in qualitative research: Perspectives, strategies, reconceptualization, and recommendations. *Dimensions of Critical Care Nursing*, 36(4), 253-263.
- Guest et al., (2012), Chapter 4: Validity and Reliability in Qualitative Research and Data Analysis, pp. 79-106
- Simons, L., Lathlean, J., & Squire, C. (2008). Shifting the focus: Sequential methods of analysis with qualitative data. *Qualitative Health Research*, 18(1), 120-132.
- Tong, A., Sainsbury, P, & Craig, J. (2007). Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research (COREQ): a 32-item checklist for interviews and focus groups. *International Journal of Quality in Health Care*, 19(6), 349-357.

Recommended Reading:

- Baker, C., Wuest, J., & Stern, P. N. (1992). Method slurring: the grounded theory/phenomenology example. *Journal of advanced nursing*, 17(11), 1355-1360.
- Campbell, J. L., Quincy, C., Osserman, J., & Pedersen, O. K. (2013). Coding in-depth semistructured interviews: Problems of unitization and intercoder reliability and agreement. *Sociological Methods & Research*, 42, 294-320.
- Morse, J. M. (2015). Critical analysis of strategies for determining rigor in qualitative inquiry. *Qualitative health research*, 25(9), 1212-1222.

- Nowell, L. S., Norris, J. M., White, D. E., & Moules, N. J. (2017). Thematic analysis: Striving to meet the trustworthiness criteria. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 16(1), 1609406917733847.

Week 12 | April 16 | Writing up Qualitative Research

DUE: Audit Trail #9; Critical Reading Summary #9

Required Reading:

- Guest et al., Chapter 10: Writing Up Thematic Analyses, pp. 241-278
- Kaiser, K. (2009). Protecting respondent confidentiality in qualitative research. *Qualitative Health Research*, 19(11), 1632-1641.
- Krumer-Nevo, M., & Sidi, M. (2012). Writing against othering. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 18(4), 299-309.
- Morse, J. M., & Coulehan, J. (2015). Maintaining confidentiality in qualitative publications. *Qualitative Health Research*, 25(2), 151.
- Sandelowski, M., & Leeman, J. (2012). Writing usable qualitative health research findings. *Qualitative Health Research*, 22(10), 1404-1413.

Recommended Reading:

- Shin, K. R., Kim, M. Y., & Chung, S. E. (2009). Methods and strategies utilized in published qualitative research. *Qualitative Health Research*, 19(6), 850-858.
- Tracy, S. J. (2012). The toxic and mythical combination of a deductive writing logic for inductive qualitative research. *Departures in Critical Qualitative Research*, 1(1), 109-141.

Week 13 | April 23 | WORKSHOP III

DUE: Workshop Presentation #3 (*Suggested: All coding finished*)

Week 14 | April 30 | In-Class Peer Review

DUE: Complete draft of final report

Week 15 | May 7 | Emotional and Moral Dilemmas in Qualitative Analysis

DUE: Revised Final Blog Post

Required Reading:

- Bowtell, E. C., Sawyer, S. M., Aroni, R. A., Green, J. B., & Duncan, R. E. (2013). "Should I send a condolence card?" Promoting emotional safety in qualitative health research through reflexivity and ethical mindfulness. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 19(9), 652-663.
- Coles, J., & Mudaly, N. (2010). Staying safe: Strategies for qualitative child abuse researchers. *Child Abuse Review: Journal of the British Association for the Study and Prevention of Child Abuse and Neglect*, 19(1), 56-69.
- Jackson, S., Backett-Milburn, K., & Newall, E. (2013). Researching distressing topics: Emotional reflexivity and emotional labor in the secondary analysis of children and young people's narratives of abuse. *Sage open*, 3(2), 2158244013490705.

Recommended Reading:

- Boden, Z. V., Gibson, S., Owen, G. J., & Benson, O. (2016). Feelings and intersubjectivity in qualitative suicide research. *Qualitative Health Research*, 26(8), 1078-1090.
- Gemignani, M. (2011). Between researcher and researched: An introduction to countertransference in qualitative inquiry. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 17(8), 701-708.
- Kiyimba, N., & O'Reilly, M. (2016). The risk of secondary traumatic stress in the qualitative transcription process: A research note. *Qualitative Research*, 16(4), 468-476.

- Kumar, S., & Cavallaro, L. (2018). Researcher self-care in emotionally demanding research: A proposed conceptual framework. *Qualitative Health Research*, 28(4), 648-658.

***** Final Reports due Thursday, May 14 at 5:00 pm *****