

Analysing and interpreting qualitative data using ATLAS.ti 2

Lecturer: Gerben Moerman

Lecturer, Department of Sociology and Anthropology.

Office: Spinhuis A0.02, Oudezijds Achterburgwal 185.

Office hours: by appointment – just drop me an email and we can agree a mutually convenient time

Email: gmoerman@uva.nl



René Magritte, The Treachery of Images (1926). (Ceci n'est pas une pipe; "This is not a pipe"). Oil on canvas.

Course Contents

Already in 1990, Renata Tesch wrote a book on how to use computers for 27 different analysis methods. However, recent publications such as Macmillan's (2005) show that many qualitative analysts are not impressed with the usefulness of software.

Qualitative data analysis software are well accepted for so called more "systematic" or more rigour approaches, but often not for more interpretative methods.

In this second QDA course we will focus on the use of ATLAS.ti in order to assist different genres of qualitative analysis, such as Phenomenology, Phenomenography, Frame analysis, Ethnomethodology & Conversation analysis, Discourse analysis and Narrative analysis. In each seminar one of the genres will be presented, discussed and critically assessed on the feasibility of using software for this type of analysis.

Format:

The seminars are based on four teaching methods: Introductory lectures, class discussion of the reading material, computer seminars and individual or group work.

Every week, you are required to do all readings in advance, and invited to participate actively in the collective discussion. In the computer seminars we will work with ATLAS.ti and see what choices are made in different genres of qualitative analysis.

Attendance is mandatory.

Place and time:

REC-P 1.27 (computer room)

Fridays from 9 to 13 (sometimes 12).

Objectives

The learning objectives for this course are that students after this course will have gained insight in Qualitative analysis in general and more specifically on approaches after the linguistic turn, such as Phenomenology, Ethnomethodology, Discourse Analysis, Narrative Analysis, Frame analysis, Semiotics and Phenomenography. After the course, students will be able to analyse qualitative data using one of these genres and ATLAS.ti.

Assessment:

Assessment will be based on class discussions and pitches (5%), Weekly quests of literature (25%) four assignments (30%) and a final assignment (40%). Anti-plagiarism rules apply.

Resits will be only possible for the final assignment, the Rules and Guidelines for the Master's programme apply.

he report (in word document or pdf) is to be uploaded to Ephorus on Blackboard as well.

Weekly Quest for Literature (25%)

The literature we read in this course is rather theoretical or methodological. Therefore, all students search for **two** articles for a relevant application of one of the genres we use that week (week 2, 3, 4, 5, 6) See for the exact genres the bold and italic genres in the week schedule. The article has to bear some relevance for your own analysis for your final assignment. You have to **post** the reference (and link), a copy of the abstract and a single-paragraph discussion why this article might be interesting for your own analysis.

The *Weekly quest for literature* is marked with pass or fail only (5% per week).

Assignment 1: Present Your Data (10%)

For the final assignment every student needs to do a qualitative analysis using one of the genres discussed in this course. What does an interpretative epistemology based on phenomenology mean for your data?

In this first assignment every student “elevator pitches” the data he or she want to use for the final assignment. Aspects to discuss are the topic of the data, the form of the data as well as the feasibility of using ATLAS.ti on these data. Create a short (single page 200 words maximum) **handout** for your fellow students and your lecturer (about 26 copies).

The assignment is marked with pass or fail only.

The handout is to be uploaded to Blackboard before April 19th, 2013, 9.00.

Assignment 2: Discuss Your Genre (10%)

Write a short discussion proposal on the **genre** of qualitative analysis you use in order to analyse your data for your final assignment. Per genre a thread will be created on the BB forum in which you can post your proposal and one or more statements. In class we split up in groups per genre, in order to discuss some statements. Read the online discussions in your own thread before joining class. (if there are not enough statements in your genre, select another thread to join).

Maximum length: 300 words

To be uploaded to Blackboard **before April 25th, 2013, 9.00** and the statements are to be taken to class on paper on April 26th.

The assignment is marked with pass or fail only.

Assignment 3: Share Your Problems (5%)

Post a short description of your analysis process so far on the BB-forum. Start with a short introduction in which you explain your research question, followed by a short description of how you’ve approached your analysis. Share your problems and think aloud about possible solutions. Be prepared to discuss at least one of those questions in class.

Maximum length: 500 words

To be taken to class on paper and uploaded to Blackboard on May 3rd, 2013, 9.00.

The assignment is marked with pass or fail only.

Assignment 4: Help Your Friends (5%)

React intelligently to at least three posts on the forum before May 10th, 2013, 9.00.

The assignment is marked with pass or fail only.

Final Assignment: Methodological report on qualitative analysis (40%)

The final assignment is a qualitative analysis and report on it. The analysis could be on **any topic**, using **on of the genre** of qualitative analysis we discuss in this course, using **any kind of digital data**. Since you are free to choose your own topic and genre, the type of data collection is up to you. However, since this course is not on qualitative data collection (although that shows a terrible single-mindedness), and qualitative data collection in classical ways would take a lot of time, I would suggest you to use existing materials. Those materials could be anything, such as transcribed interviews, policy documents, observations, pictures, movies, songs, maps, newspaper articles, letters to the editors, tweets, internet forum discussions, YouTube comments, TED-seminars or whatever you can think of.

In the past many of my students have for chosen for newspaper articles using Lexis Nexis. I will briefly describe how it works, but using it is not obligatory.

LexisNexis is a digital newspaper archive that contains a large number of contributions from newspapers. Access to the archive is free within the UvA-domain (and via VPN). You can use a powerful search engine to select documents. Think and reflect on the sampling method.

Obviously while choosing topic and data, you should also delve into the method. In small groups we will assist other students in this delving and their analytical choices and technical issues.

The main focus of the report, however, will be the methodology *used* for the qualitative analysis.

To be handed in on paper in my pigeonhole at the Spinhuis (a.002) and uploaded to Blackboard on May 24th, 2013, 17.00.

Length: between 2600 and 3400 words (Not including appendices)

Session	First half of the session	Second half of the session	Background literature	Specific Literature
Week 1 Apr. 5	Introduction	Explanation of Assignment 1 Groupwork 1 Explanation of Weekly Quest for Literature Explanation of Final Assignment	Friese (2012) intro & chapter 1	
Week 2 Apr. 12	ATLAS.Ti for the Unlucky Ones	Explanation of Assignment 2 Phenomenology	Moses & Knutsen (2007) Chapter 2 & 8	Schütz (1953), Eberle (2010), Psathas (2004)
Week 3 Apr. 19	Assignment 1: Present your Data	Ethnomethodology Conversation Analysis Membership Categorisation Analysis	Ten Have (2004) Chapter 2 & 3	Garfinkel (1996) Schegloff (2007) Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson (1974) Discussion Emirbayer & Maynard (2011)
Week 4 Apr. 26	Assignment 2: Discuss your Genre	Discourse	Jørgenson & Phillips (2002) Chapter 1, 3 & 4	Potter (2001) Macmillan (2005)
Week 5 May. 3	Assignment 3: Share your Problems	Narrative Analysis Frame Analysis	Riessman (2001) König (2004)	McAdams (2011)
Week 6 May. 10	Assignment 4: Help your Friends	Semiotics Phenomenography	Penn (2000) Svensson (1997)	Hasselgren & Beach (1997)
Week 7 May. 17	Pitch reflection	Evaluation	Wolcott (2002)	
Week 8 May. 24	No Class only Deadline	Deadline final report		

Literature

- Bryman, Alan. (2008) *Social research methods*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Eberle, T. S. (2010). The Phenomenological Life-World Analysis and the Methodology of the Social Sciences. *Human Studies*, 33(2-3), 123–139.
<http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007%2Fs10746-010-9146-9>
- Emirbayer, M., & Maynard, D. W. (2011). Pragmatism and Ethnomethodology. *Qualitative Sociology*, 34(1), 221–261. doi:10.1007/s11133-010-9183-8
Complete discussion: <http://link.springer.com/journal/11133/34/1/page/1>
- Heritage, J. (2011). A Galilean Moment in Social Theory? Language, Culture and their Emergent Properties. *Qualitative Sociology*, 34(1), 263–270. doi:10.1007/s11133-010-9180-y
- Quéré, L., & Terzi, C. (2011). Some Features of Pragmatist Thought Still Remain Insufficiently Explored in Ethnomethodology. *Qualitative Sociology*, 34(1), 271–275. doi:10.1007/s11133-010-9182-9
- Rawls, A. W. (2011). Garfinkel, Ethnomethodology and the Defining Questions of Pragmatism. *Qualitative Sociology*, 34(1), 277–282. doi:10.1007/s11133-010-9185-6
- Winship, C., & Muller, C. (2011). Ethnomethodology and Consequences: Comment on Emirbayer and Maynard's "Pragmatism and Ethnomethodology." *Qualitative Sociology*, 34(1), 283–286. doi:10.1007/s11133-010-9179-4
- Friese, Susanne (2012) Introduction & One: Getting to Know ATLAS.ti. In: *Qualitative Data Analysis with ATLAS.ti*. Sage Publications.
http://www.sagepub.com/upm-data/45142_Friese.pdf
- Garfinkel, H. (1996). Ethnomethodology's Program. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 59(1), 5–21.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.2307/2787116>
- Hasselgren, B., & Beach, D. (1997). Phenomenography—a “good-for-nothing brother” of phenomenology? Outline of an analysis. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 16(2), 191–202.
<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/0729436970160206>
- Have, ten, P. (2004). *Understanding qualitative research and ethnomethodology*. London: Sage Publications.
- Jørgensen, M. W., & Phillips, L. J. (2002). *Discourse analysis as theory and method*. SAGE Publications.
http://www.uk.sagepub.com/upm-data/9452_011011Ch1.pdf
<http://www.rasaneh.org/Images/News/AttachFile/27-3-1391/FILE634754469767402343.pdf>
- König, Thomas (2005) Frame Analysis: An Introduction, *ESRC Methods Resources*, <http://www.ccsr.ac.uk/methods/publications/frameanalysis/>
- Macmillan, Katie (2005). More than just coding? Evaluating CAQDAS in a discourse analysis of news texts. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research [on-Line Journal]*, 6(3). <http://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:0114-fqs0503257>

- McAdams, D. P. (2011). Exploring Psychological Themes Through Life-Narrative Accounts. In J. A. Holstein & J. F. Gubrium (Eds.), *Varieties of Narrative Analysis* (p. 15). Sage Publications.
http://www.uk.sagepub.com/upm-data/41822_1.pdf
- Moses, J. W., & Knutsen, T. L. (2007). *Ways of knowing: competing methodologies in social and political research*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Penn, G. (2000). Semiotic analysis of still images. In M. W. Bauer & G. Gaskell (Eds.), *Qualitative Researching with Text, Image and Sound: A Practical handbook* (pp. 227–245). London: Sage Publications.
- Potter, Jonathan (2001) *Wittgenstein and Austin* in Wetherell, M. Taylor, S. and Yates, S. *Discourse Theory and Practice: A Reader*. London: Sage Publications. Pp. 39-46
<http://www.umass.edu/accela/ilc/794d/pdf/Wittgestein%20and%20Austin.pdf>
- Psthas, G. (2004). Alfred Schutz's Influence on American Sociologists and Sociology. *Human Studies*, 27(1), 1–35.
<http://www.springerlink.com/content/q131825n10008576/>
- Riessman, C. K. (2001). Analysis of personal narratives. In J. Gubrium & J. Holstein (Eds.), *Handbook of Interviewing*. Sage Publications Inc Thousand Oaks, CA.
<http://alumni.media.mit.edu/~brooks/storybiz/riessman.pdf>
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, 696–735.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.2307/412243>
- Schegloff, E. (2007). A tutorial on membership categorization. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 39(3), 462–482.
<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0378216606001640>
- Schütz, A. (1953). Common Sense and Scientific Interpretation of Human Action. *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, 14(1), 1–38.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/2104013>
- Svensson, L. (1997). Theoretical Foundations of Phenomenography. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 16(2), 159–171.
<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/0729436970160204>
- Tesch, Renata (1990). *Qualitative Research: Analysis Types and Software Tools*. London: Routledge.
- Wolcott, H. F. (2002). Writing Up Qualitative Research... Better. *Qualitative Health Research*, 12(1), 91–103.
http://www.sagepub.com/gray/Website%20material/Journals/qhr_wolcott.pdf